The American Ecclesiastical Review

VOL. CXXVII, No. 5 NOVEMBER, 1952

CONTENTS

A Sixth Century Sermon on Sin ..... *Henry G. J. Beck* 321

A New Title for Mary ..... *Titus Cranny, S.A.* 330

A New Historical Project: Editing the Papers of Archbishop John Carroll ..... *Henry J. Browne* 341

The Structure of Parochial Societies *Joseph H. Fichter, S.J.* 351

The Syro-Phoenician Woman ..... *Elmer A. McNamara* 360

Father Journet's Concept of the Church *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 370

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Baptismal Difficulties 381

Betrothal Ceremony 382

Bell at Benediction 382

Anniversary Requiem 382

Seniority to be Observed at Communion Time 383

Flag in Sanctuary 383

Tabernacle Key 383

Reconsecration of Chalice 384

Dress for Mixed Marriage 384

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1952, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Mass Stipend, *ad intentionem dantis* 384
The Right to Administer Holy Communion 385
Honesty in Sports 385

BOOK REVIEWS

One Shepherd: The Problem of Christian Reunion, *by Charles Boyer, S.J.* 388
The Sacred Canons, *by John A. Abbo and Jerome D. Hannan* 390
The Virgin Mary, *by Jean Guitton* 392
The Enemy Within, *by Raymond J. de Jaegher and Irene Corbally Kuhn* 394
Père Lamy, *by Comte Paul Biver* 396
The Secret of Holiness, *by Father James, O.F.M.Cap.* 397
Christ Unconquered, *by Arthur Little* 398
The Spirit of St. François De Sales, *translated by C. F. Kelley* 399

A CHRISTMAS SUGGESTION FOR EVERY PRIEST

Why not give a year's subscription to The American Ecclesiastical Review?
To—Your Priest Friends • The Newly Ordained • Seminarians
Twelve times a year your thoughtful gift will bring renewed spiritual and intellectual inspiration, with gratitude for the giver.
A gift card will be sent on your directive.
Don't wait. Make up your list today.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIATICAL REVIEW
The Catholic University of America Press
Washington 17, D. C.

Gentlemen: Please send gift subscription to the following:

Name.....

Address.....

City..... Zone..... State.....

I enclose my check for $.....

United States, Canada and Foreign $5.00
Special Seminarian Rate $3.50
List additional names on separate sheet.

A SIXTH-CENTURY SERMON ON SIN

Throughout much of the Middle Ages the most widely copied homily of St. Caesarius, Archbishop of Arles from 502-542, seems to have been the sermon which today is numbered 179 in the critical edition by Dom Germain Morin.[1] In the past, no doubt, its popularity rested largely upon its differentiating between and its cataloging of the serious sins which destroy the spiritual life and the smaller offenses which deform it. Today, perhaps, of greater interest is the clear view it takes as to the penalties awaiting sin after death—purgatory as well as hell are mentioned explicitly—and the practices it has to suggest for the sinner's making atonement in this life. Better than lengthier compositions of the same period, this Caesarian sermon reveals how concretely theology had developed at the hands of ancient prelates whose concern was with the care of souls rather than with speculation. Here, surely, the theologian comes upon an admirable example of the ordinary *magisterium* of the Church at work in a distant epoch.

As far as the present writer is aware, this work has not appeared before in English dress. The rendition which follows of a homily penned and preached prior to 542 A.D.[2] is presented to the American clergy to the end that it may aid in deepening their reverence for the venerable antiquity of the doctrines wherewith they feed their faithful.

[1] G. Morin: *Sancti Caesarii episcopi Arelatensis Opera Omnia* (Maredsous, 1937), I, 2, pp. 684-89. Morin's text is based upon the following mss: Berlin theol. fol. 355; Venice, s. Marci VI, 5; Chartres 67. It is an edition much superior to that of the Maurists reproduced in PL 39, 1946-1949.

[2] Since the scriptural text which this homily expounds appears in the Gallican liturgy exclusively as the Epistle in the Mass for the Dedication of a Church—witness the Bobbio Missal (PL 72, 533) and the Luxeuil Lectionary (ed. Pierre Salmon, Vatican City, 1944, pp. 207 f.)—it is quite possible that Caesarius first wrote the sermon for such a ceremony. The only church with the inauguration of which we can connect Caesarius' name is St. Mary's basilica, dedicated at Arles on June 6, 524, cf. Morin: *S. Caesarii Opera Omnia* (1942), II, p. 60. This edifice did not lie outside Arles, as Morin suggests, but within the south-east angle of the city walls, on or near the site now occupied by the *Asile de saint Césaire*, cf. H. G. J. Beck: *The Pastoral Care of Souls in South-East France during the Sixth Century* (Rome, 1950), pp. 366 ff.

* * * * *

ADMONITION OF ST. CAESARIUS, BISHOP OF ARLES, ON THE PASSAGE FROM THE EPISTLE WHERE IT IS SAID: "IF ANY MAN'S WORK ABIDES, HE WILL RECEIVE REWARD, IF HIS WORK BURNS, HE WILL SUFFER LOSS"

1) In the passage from the Epistle (*lectione apostolica*)[3] read to us a few moments ago, beloved brethren, we have heard the Apostle say that "other foundation no one can lay but that which has been laid, which is Christ Jesus. But if anyone builds upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, straw, the work of each will be made manifest, for the day will declare it, since it will be revealed in fire and the fire will assay the quality of everyone's work. If his work abides which he has built thereon, he will receive reward; if his work burns, he will suffer loss, though he himself will be saved, yet so as through fire."[4] Many there are who, misinterpreting this passage, are deceived by a false sense of security, believing that if they build capital transgressions (*crimina capitalia*) upon the foundation of Christ, such sins can be cleansed by a fire which passes (*per ignem transitorium*), and they themselves can come at length to everlasting life. An interpretation of this kind must be set aside, beloved brethren, because they who indulge such fancies make victims of themselves. For it is not the capital but rather the lesser sins (*minuta peccata*) which get cleansed by the passing fire of which the Apostle said, "he himself will be saved, yet so as through fire." And what is worse, although not only the major sins but the lesser as well prove overwhelming (*mergunt*) if they be too numerous,[5] mention must be made of some at least

[3] For the use of *lectio apostolica* or *Apostolus* by the Gallican liturgy to designate the Epistle of the Mass, cf. Caesarius: *Sermon* 73, n. 2 (ed. Morin, I, p. 294), Gregory of Tours: *Historia Francorum*, IV, 16 (Mon. Germ. Hist., *SS. rerum Merov.*, I, pp. 154 f.) and the *Expositio brevis antiquae liturgiae gallicanae* (ed. J. Quasten, Münster-i-W., 1934, pp. 13 f.).

[4] *I Cor.* 3:11-15. For a somewhat different exegesis of this passage, cf. St. Augustine: *Enchiridion*, 68, 69 (PL 40, 264 f.).

[5] Cf. the reference to the lesser sins in St. Augustine: *Sermon* IX, 18 (PL 38, 89): "non sunt levia quia plura; quia vero quotidiana et plurima, timenda est ruina multitudinis, etsi non magnitudinis." Caesarius touches the root-problem of the *minuta* in his *Sermon* 64, n. 2 (ed. Morin, I, p. 264): "de multitudine peccatorum desperatio nascitur, ex desperatione vero absque

among the major and the minor sins lest anyone foolishly try to find excuse for himself and to maintain that he does not know which are the lesser sins and which the capital transgressions.

2) And while the Apostle has referred to many capital sins, in order that we may not seem to give grounds for despair, we ourselves shall point out but briefly which these are. Sacrilege, murder, adultery, false witness, theft, rapine, pride, envy, avarice, long-maintained anger, continued drunkenness, and detraction fall into this category.[6] For unless the man who knows full well that sins of this kind hold him captive embarks upon suitable penance and (if time allows) carries it through for a long period, giving generously of alms and keeping himself from the commission of further sin, he cannot be cleansed by that passing fire of which the Apostle spoke, but will be tortured beyond all relief in everlasting flame.

3) However, in the matter of the lesser sins, though they may be known to all, there is need for our naming some at least among them, even if it would take too long to list them all. Whenever a person consumes more than is required in the way of food or drink, or whenever he chatters to excess or keeps silent longer than he should, or whenever he treats an importunate beggar harshly, or whenever, being perfectly well, he decides to partake of food while others are fasting or, in his addiction to sleep, rises tardily for church, or whenever he has relations with his wife for motives other than procreation (*excepto desiderio filiorum*),[7] or whenever he shows himself sluggish in visiting the imprisoned and calls but infrequently upon the ill, he knows full well that these are counted among the lesser sins. So, too, a man offends if he fails to call the quarrelling to concord, or if he treats his neighbor, his wife, his

---

ulla reverentia peccatorum frena laxantur," cf. Paul Lejay: "Le rôle théologique de Césaire d'Arles," *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses,* X (1905), pp. 482 f.

[6] For other examples of the *capitalia,* cf. Caesarius: *Sermon* 189, n. 2 (ed. Morin, I, 2, p. 731); *Sermon* 229, n. 4 (*ibid.,* p. 863). St. Augustine lists "peccata . . . illa quae crimina nominantur" in his *Sermon* 261, n. 9 (PL 38, 1206); *Sermon* 56, n. 12 (*ibid.,* 382); and *De catechizandis rudibus,* 48 (ed. J. P. Christopher, Washington, 1926, pp. 108, 110).

[7] Caesarius' teaching is put succinctly in *Sermon* 44, n. 3 (ed. Morin, I, p. 188): "Qui enim bonus christianus est . . . uxorem suam excepto desiderio filiorum non agnoscit: quia uxor non propter libidinem, sed propter filiorum

son or his servant with greater sternness than is called for, or if he flatters to excess or, of his own accord or under pressure, decides to fawn upon some person of importance, or if he sets out over-delicate and sumptuous banquets while the poor go hungry, or if inside or outside church he indulges in the idle gossip for which account must be given on Judgment Day. Without doubt we also commit fault when, having taken a rash oath and being unable to keep it through some difficulty, we proceed to perjure ourselves, or when lightly and thoughtlessly we call down evil, since it is written: "neither will the evil-tongued possess the Kingdom of God,"[8] or when we rashly entertain suspicions which often turn out to lack the support we thought them to have. Beyond question these and the like belong to the category of lesser sins.[9] As I have said before, all of these cannot be enumerated, but no Christian people nor any of the saints has ever or can ever be free from them.[10] Though we may not believe that sins of this kind destroy the soul, they do, however, disfigure it, covering it, as it were, with blisters and horrible scabs and scarcely, or only in the greatest confusion, allowing it to come to the embrace of the Heavenly Spouse of Whom it is written: "He has fashioned for Himself the Church having neither spot nor wrinkle."[11]

4) And thus it is by constant prayer and by frequent fasting and by generous almsgiving and by the forgiving of those who offend us that the lesser sins may continually be cancelled, lest by growing

---

procreationem accipitur"; cf. St. Augustine: *De bono conjugali,* 11 (PL 40, 381): "Concubitus enim necessarius causa generandi, inculpabilis et solus ipse nuptialis est. Ille autem qui ultra istam necessitatem progreditur, jam non rationi, sed libidini obsequitur." For an analysis of Augustine's views on this point, cf. Godefroy: "Le mariage au temps des Pères," *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique,* IX, cc. 2094 ff.

[8] *I Cor.* 6:10.

[9] There is another listing of the *minuta* in Caesarius: *Sermon* 64, n. 2 (ed. Morin, I, pp. 263 f.). On this and the listing of *Sermon* 179, cf. E. Göller: "Studien über das gallische Busswesen zur Zeit Caesarius von Arles und Gregors von Tours," *Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht,* 109 (1929), pp. 41 f. St. Augustine has a survey of the *peccata quotidiana* in his *Sermon* IX, 18 (PL 38, 88).

[10] St. Augustine: *Enchiridion,* 71 (PL 40, 265) also speaks of the lesser sins as "sine quibus haec vita non ducitur." The same teaching is reaffirmed by the Council of Trent, Session VI, can. 23 (DB, 833).

[11] *Eph.* 5:27.

into a multitude they overwhelm by their weight (*demergant*). For whatever portion of these sins fails to be atoned for by our own efforts must be cleansed in that fire of which the Apostle said that "it is to be revealed in fire and he whose work burns will suffer loss." Indeed, while we are as yet in this world, either we submit ourselves to the discipline of penance or at least by God's will and permission we are plagued with many afflictions because of our sins and are set free from them if we show gratitude to God. This occurs as often as a husband or a wife or a child is snatched away in death, or whenever the possessions which we cherish more than we should are taken away from us. Although actually we may love Christ more than we do the possessions and be willing to forego them, if needs be, rather than to deny Christ, still because we cherish these (as I have said) more than we should, we find ourselves able to part with them in life or at death only with the severest pain.[12] And yet if, like good children, we show gratitude to God Who, as a loving father, has permitted our goods to be taken from us and if we humbly admit that actually we suffer less than we deserve, our sins are cleansed in this life so that nothing, or very little certainly, remains for the purgatorial fire (*ignis ille purgatorius*) to burn away in the life to come. But if we do not show God gratitude in tribulation nor cancel sin through good works, we shall be held fast in the purgatorial fire for a period long enough to consume the aforesaid lesser sins, just as though they were wood or hay or straw.

5) But someone will object: "It matters very little to me how long I may be held fast as long as I pass on to life eternal." Let no one say this, beloved brethren, because the purgatorial fire will be far more severe (*durior*) than any torment which can be seen or imagined or known in this world. And since it has been written of Judgment Day that "one day will be like a thousand years and a thousand years like one day,"[13] how can anyone know whether it will be days or months or even years that he will be passing through that fire? And if a man does not now willingly hold even one finger in fire, why should he not fear then having to undergo torture of body and soul for a not inconsiderable period? And,

[12] St. Augustine: *Enchiridion*, 68 (PL 40, 264 f.) seems to have supplied the point of departure for Caesarius' remarks on attachment to wealth.
[13] *II Pet.* 3:8.

consequently, let each one strive to the best of his ability to avoid capital transgressions and so to cancel the lesser sins through good works that little indeed or nothing at all will be left for the consuming action of that fire. However, they who fall into capital sins and who refuse to make amends in this life through the medicament of penance (*paenitentiae medicamento*)[14] will not have the opportunity of attaining to that fire whereof the Apostle speaks: "he himself, however, will be saved, yet so as through fire," but will rather harken to that stern and irrevocable sentence: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire."[15] And so let all who are desirous of escaping the everlasting as well as the purgatorial torment not commit capital transgressions or, if they have been guilty of them, let them undertake fruitful penance and not leave off atoning for the smaller, daily sins by the practice of good works.

6) I do, however, wish to point out to you with greater detail the works whereby the lesser sins are cancelled. As often as we visit the sick, seek out the imprisoned, restore the quarrelling to concord, observe the fast prescribed in church, wash the feet of guests, frequent the vigils, give alms to the poor passing our doors, forgive our enemies upon their asking pardon: by these and similar practices are the lesser sins atoned for from day to day (*cotidie redimuntur*).[16]

7) But for capital transgressions works of this type do not suffice by themselves; to them there must be added weeping and

[14] The term *paenitentiae medicamentum* appears with the meaning of sacramental Penance in Caesarius: *Sermon* 64, n. 1 (ed. Morin, I, p. 263); 65, n. 1 (*ibid.*, p. 267); and in the contemporary *Vita Caesarii*, II, 11 (ed. Morin, II, p. 329); as does *poenitentiae medicina* in St. Leo the Great: *Epistle* 108, cap. 2 (PL 54, 1011 f.). For St. Augustine's use of the term, cf. R. C. Mortimer: *The Origins of Private Penance in the Western Church* (Oxford, 1939), p. 70: "*medicamentum*, wherever Augustine is speaking of penance and of sin, always refers to ecclesiastical penance and ecclesiastical means of grace. Bishops are *medici*. The Scriptures, Baptism, and the Eucharist are *medicamenta*. Public penance is *medicina coelestis*. The Lord's Prayer is *medicina quotidiana*."

[15] *Matt.* 25:41.

[16] On *peccata redimere* as the technical term for atoning for the lesser sins, cf. B. Poschmann: *Die abendländische Kirchenbusse im Ausgang des christlichen Altertums* (Munich, 1928), p. 84. For St. Augustine's views on the means of atoning for *peccata quotidiana*, cf. P. Batiffol: *Études d'histoire et de théologie positive* (8th ed., Paris, 1926), I, pp. 200 ff.

groaning and sighing, frequent and long-drawn out fasts, the giving of alms even to a point beyond our means, the voluntary cutting off of ourselves from ecclesiastical communion in an abiding attitude of sorrow and remorse, together with the public undertaking of penance,[17] for it is fitting that he who has worked destruction to himself to the ruin of many should work his restoration (*se redimat*) to the edification of many. In the last analysis, what I have to suggest is neither impossible nor overly difficult; let us thus, at least, lament the death of our own soul just as we grieve over the dead body of someone else. Upon the death of a wife or a son or a husband, people throw themselves to the earth, tearing at their hair and beating at their breasts, and bereaved and tearful go without nourishment for no little time. I beg you, brethren, let us show the same regard for our own soul which men manifest for the bodies of others. See how wrong it is, brethren, to seek for that which we cannot obtain and not to seek for that which we can obtain. We weep over the body which we cannot restore, yet we do not weep over the dead soul which we can bring back to its former state. But what is more seriously to our detriment, we lament the dead body which we cherish while we neither grieve over nor lament the dead soul which we cherish not. And therefore, changing matters, let us begin to reverence the master more than the servant, that is, the Maker of the body more than the body itself, to revere the mistress more than the maid, that is, the soul fashioned in the image of God more than the body formed from the slime of the earth, so that when on its last day our body falls prey to corruption and begins to be consumed by worms in the tomb, our soul may be carried by angelic hands to Abraham's bosom and, having had the body restored by the resurrection, on Judgment Day we may be counted worthy of the commendation: "Well done, thou good servant, enter into the joy of thy Lord."[18]

8) And in order that what we have treated above may be rooted in your minds the more firmly, and that the passage from the Epistle may be understood the more fully, I should like to repeat it briefly for your good selves. All the saints who serve God

[17] The system of Public Penance known to Caesarius is described in H. G. J. Beck: *The Pastoral Care of Souls in South-East France during the Sixth Century*, pp. 191-98.

[18] *Matt.* 25:21.

faithfully strive both to devote themselves to reading and to prayer and to persevere in good works, erecting neither capital transgressions nor lesser sins, that is, wood, hay and straw, upon the foundation which is Christ, but rather building thereon good works, that is gold, silver, precious stones; all these will pass unscathed through the fire of which the Apostle said that it will be revealed in fire. They, however, who, though they may not commit capital transgressions, readily fall into lesser sins and are negligent about atoning for them will, indeed, attain to eternal life inasmuch as they have believed in Christ and have not been guilty of capital sins. But first through God's justice and mercy, as has been noted, either they will have to undergo severe tribulations in this world, or through God's mercy they will have to free themselves by generous almsgiving and by the gracious pardoning of their enemies, or else in order to attain to everlasting life without wrinkle or stain assuredly they will have to be tortured for a lengthy period in that fire whereof the Apostle spoke. But they who have been guilty of murder or sacrilege or adultery or similar evils noted will not be held worthy to pass through the purgatorial fire to life, but will be cast down to death in unending fire, unless suitable penance will have come to their aid.

9) And so whenever you shall hear the passage from the Epistle: "if anyone builds upon the foundation of Christ gold, silver, precious stones," take this to have reference to saintly and perfect Christians who, like purified gold, will deserve to attain to eternal rewards. But they who build wood, hay and straw, are to be thought of as good Christians, negligent, nonetheless (as has often been said), about atoning for the lesser sins. If divine justice does not cleanse these sins through many afflictions, nor the individual make amends for them through generous almsgiving, then in bitter suffering there will be fulfilled of them that whereof the Apostle spoke: "If anyone's work burns he will suffer loss, he himself will be saved, yet so as through fire." However, as has been pointed out, let no one delude himself by thinking that this can hold true of capital transgressions which remain without attention. And, therefore, as I have urged so often, let us strive to the best of our ability with God's help to avoid the major sins, and by loving our enemies and by giving generously of alms, to make constant amends for the lesser sins which cannot be avoided, Our Lord

Jesus Christ granting us this blessing, who liveth and reigneth with the Father and the Holy Ghost, world without end, Amen.[19]

HENRY G. J. BECK

Immaculate Conception Seminary
Darlington, New Jersey

[19] The concluding phrase: *"praestante domino nostro . . ."* or *"quod ipse dominus praestare dignetur"* is characteristic of the Bishop of Arles; Morin: *S. Caesarii Opera Omnia*, I, p. 90 n., calls it "conclusio quae . . . plane Caesarium refert."

IN SEPTEMBER, 1902

In the September, 1902, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* the leading article, contributed by Fr. H. G. Hughes, of Shefford, England, is entitled "'Catholic' or 'Roman Catholic.'" The author relates the interesting discussions that took place in the Vatican Council in connection with the suggested phrase "Sancta Romana Catholica Ecclesia." Some objected to the "Romana" on the score that the phrase might be understood as referring to the particular church of the Roman diocese, while others feared that it might be taken to imply that the universal church under the headship of the Roman Pontiff is only one of several Catholic churches (the branch theory). Finally, the Vatican Council settled the problem by using the phrase "Sancta Catholica Apostolica Romana Ecclesia." In reference to the term "Roman Catholic" Fr. Hughes says: "If anyone please to call us 'Roman Catholics' we need not be at pains to correct him, unless it be clearly his intention to imply thereby that he too is a 'Catholic' though not a 'Roman.'" . . . Fr. W. Stang, of Providence, writes on "The Question of a Vocation to the Religious State." He defends the opinion that, unlike the vocation to the priesthood, the vocation to the religious state need not be special, but *per se* may be found in the general call of Christ to all who would follow the way of the commandments. However, he admits, some receive a special call. . . . Fr. A. Manning, of England, lays down rules as to when the last sacraments should be given to persons suffering from various types of fever. . . . Fr. H. Pope, O.P., writes on modern spiritualism, pointing out that spiritistic seances may offer an opening to the activities of the evil spirits. . . . A clerical correspondent complains of the dishonesty of some church builders, signing himself "One who has been bitten." . . . The Conference section mentions plans for the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Pontificate of Pope Leo XIII.

F. J. C.

A NEW TITLE FOR MARY

Devotion to the Mother of God is as old as the Church. For the faithful of every age and nation have sought to honor the masterpiece of God's handiwork and love with tributes of piety in every form. They built their wayside shrines and their magnificent cathedrals, they fashioned metal, stone, glass, and wood into monuments of priceless art and symbols of enduring love. They put in prose and poetry the effusions of their minds and hearts and used their talents to extend the cultus of Mary both in the liturgy as well as in private prayer. Then as if their love were not sufficient, they arrayed the Madonna with a vast and varied galaxy of titles, both to honor her incomparable dignity as well as to proclaim their love. Each title is a reflection of the fervor of a people and the surpassing beauty of the Virgin Mary.

Each title of Our Lady has its own history and significance, its own part in the devotional life of a village, town, city, or country. At times they arose after some manifestation of God's providence as at Guadalupe when a cascade of Castilian roses before the bishop and the enchanting painting on a peon's *tilma* brought all Mexico to its knees. Then too they have originated after some apparition to some favored souls, as at La Salette, Lourdes, and Fatima. In other instances they began with some famed and venerated painting as Our Lady of Czestochowa or Our Lady of Perpetual Help.

But of all the titles given our Blessed Mother, there is striking significance in the fact that one today recognized and approved by the Church began in the Protestant Episcopal body in our own country and was permitted to be used in the Church after the originators of the title entered the Fold of Peter. The title, Our Lady of the Atonement (or Our Atonement Mother), was first used by Father Paul James Francis, S.A., and Mother Lurana Mary Francis, S.A., respectively the founders of the Friars and Sisters of the Atonement of Graymoor, Garrison, New York. This title and its unusual beginning is, so far as this writer knows, a fact unparalleled in the annals of the Church.

Father Paul, for so he was known even as an Episcopalian, began to invoke the Blessed Virgin as Our Lady of the Atonement shortly after he took up residence at Graymoor in 1899 to make the foun-

dation of the Friars of the Atonement, inspired by the example of Francis of Assisi. Later, on the feast of the Holy Rosary, October 7, 1901, he formally started the Rosary League of Our Lady of the Atonement and sought to spread devotion to Mary under this title, but met with little response from his Protestant brethren. But his own affection for Our Lady was strong and deep and in his little publication, *The Lamp,* he wrote in this way:

> There is no lie forged in hell more in conflict with the will of God expressed in Scripture and Catholic tradition than the Protestant conceit that they honor Christ best, who most ignore the existence of His Mother. "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder," and there is no divorce more horrible as a flagrant violation of the *fiat* of Almighty God than the divorce made by the Protestant reformers between Christ and the Blessed Virgin. The fruit of such violence to revealed truth must of necessity be all sorts and kinds of heresy and goes far to explain the skepticism and unbelief which honeycomb the Church of England today.
>
> What English and American Churchmen need to realize, in order to become the same zealous lovers of Mary that our forefathers were, is that in Mary we have a Mother, who like her divine Son "can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities," and by the side of our great highpriest ever stands "to make intercession for us." We need to know that her knowledge is great enough, her love boundless enough, and her power vast enough to embrace us everyone, so that whosoever among us cries to her sets reverberating the heart strings of a maternal love that has at its command the inexhaustible resources of heaven.[1]

Several years followed before Father Paul and his followers entered the true Church, but when they did (October 30, 1909) they received permission to continue their mode of life and to promote their various works and interests.[2] Thus they continued the Rosary League and sought to arouse interest among Catholics with the title of Our Lady of the Atonement. In less than a decade after their "homecoming" they received approval from authorities in Rome (April 10, 1919) for the feast of Our Lady to be observed on the Saturday following the seventh Sunday after Pentecost.[3]

[1] *Lamp,* 3, 8 (August, 1905) 113.

[2] See David Gannon, *Father Paul of Graymoor* (New York, 1951), pp. 150 ff.

[3] For the decree on the indulgences see *Lamp,* 17, 12 (December, 1919), 660.

Today the feast is annually observed July 9 with its own Office and Mass; its rank is that of a double of the first class for the members of the Society of the Atonement. Later in this article we shall speak of the liturgical composition of the festival.

Perhaps the most singular characteristic of representations of Mary under the title of the Atonement is the red mantle, used to symbolize the Precious Blood of the Atonement. To someone's query: "Why the red mantle?" Father Paul replied: "The connection of the red mantle with the Atonement is very obvious. It was during the shedding of the most Precious Blood of her Divine Son, the very Blood He had derived from her own Immaculate Heart, that the redemption of the world was wrought and an atonement made for the sins of the world by the Lamb of God. Our Lady of the Atonement stood by the Cross when the Atoning Sacrifice was enacted and it is most fitting that she should wear a red mantle accepting our homage and devotion under the title of the Atonement."[4] Such too is the concept in the following stanza of the hymn in honor of Our Lady of the Atonement:

Remind us by thy mantle
All steeped in crimson red
The Precious Blood of Jesus
To save men's souls was shed.

Our Lady also wears a blue inner tunic and holds the Infant Christ in the throne of her arms. He in turn holds a cross in His right hand, for, explained Father Paul, he is the Child of the Atonement.

In honoring Mary with this title of the Atonement, Graymoor's founder stressed two points: first, her part in the mystery of the Cross, and secondly, her role in bringing about that unity or at-one-ment of men with Christ as the fruit of the sacrifice of Calvary. For just as the Mother of God had a special role as companion, helpmate, and co-sufferer with Christ in the mystery of His suffering and death, so also she continues to exercise a particular mission in the plan of salvation and sanctification, by which the merits of the Atonement are applied to the souls of men.

When speaking of Mary and Calvary it is fitting to treat her as Our Lady of Sorrows. And so Father Paul did. "When she saw

[4] *Lamp*, 22, 8 (September, 1925), 285.

her Son rejected," he wrote, "cruelly mocked, and spit upon and bearing His heavy Cross to Calvary and saw Him nailed to the tree, while she herself stood in anguish, her heavy heart was beating in union with His as the crucified Redeemer of the world."[5] But in the mystery of the world's salvation Mary was no mere spectator. She did not stand by passively while this act took place; she did not grieve only for the suffering of Jesus. She exercised a unique role and gave special cooperation, so that in the words of Arnoldus Bonneval: "Jesus and Mary offered their sacrifice similarly to God; Jesus in the blood of His body, Mary in the blood of her heart."[6] Calvary was the scene of Mary's soteriological work as well as her Son's. Though dependent upon and secondary to the sacrifice of Christ (for she herself was redeemed by Him), nevertheless she was so united to Him in love as to effect in some way the restoration of mankind with God. Thus "By her cooperation with the divine will and her participation in the chalice of Our Lord's suffering and His agony, she became our glorious Lady of the Atonement."[7] Christ was the one Mediator restoring all men to friendship with God, but Mary in an auxiliary role was "the mediatrix of the human family when she stood at the Cross as Our Lord was lifted up that He might draw all men to Himself."[8]

Elsewhere this Poverello of the twentieth century pointed out the relationship of Our Lady to the Cross. In a thought similar to that of St. Cyril of Jerusalem's "Take away Mary and the cross falls" Father Paul declared: "The slain victim taken down from the Cross is laid in the arms of His Mother all covered with His own Blood and that Blood stains the garments of the Blessed Virgin. How impossible to disassociate either Our Lord or Our Lady from the Precious Blood."[9]

To show Mary's special relation to the Blessed Trinity, Father Paul composed a prayer, the Threefold Salutation, honoring Mary as Daughter of God the Father, Mother of God the Son, and

[5] Sermon, feast of Our Lady of the Atonement, 1925.

[6] *De laudibus B. M. Virginis,* as found in Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus, series latina,* 189: 1726. Afterwards noted as *PL.*

[7] Sermon, feast of Our Lady of the Atonement, 1925.

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] *Lamp,* 91, 7 (July, 1911), 180.

Spouse of God the Holy Spirit.[10] But the mystery of the Atonement deepened the relationship: "It was not only her creation without fault or stain of sin, but the Atonement sacrifice that brought her into wonderful relation with the Three Persons of the Adorable Trinity."[11] He gave the following further interpretation of Our Lady of the Atonement:

She is necessarily "of the Atonement" since it was the will of God that she play a necessary part in the Atonement or Redemption. This is not to say that without her man would have remained unredeemed, but that God's plan gave her a large share in the redemptive work. When we address the Blessed Mother, as "of the Atonement," we mean then, that there is some very close bond between the Atonement and her, that she belongs to the Atonement and the Atonement to her. Mary, although her part is in no way similar in nature to that of her Divine Son's, cooperated with Jesus Christ, as no other creature did, in His work of reconciling man with God.

Her claim to this high title rests most solidly on the fact that she consented to become, and became the Mother of the Redeemer; that she suffered with Jesus during the Passion; and that all graces merited for mankind by Christ have come to us through Mary.[12]

But while Father Paul stressed Mary's role in the sacrifice of Calvary, he emphasized perhaps even more her part in the effect of Calvary, *viz.*, the unity of souls with God. For him Our Lady of the Atonement meant Our Lady of Unity constantly interceding for the conversion of all men to her Son. "When, therefore," he would say, "as Children of the Atonement we address the Blessed

[10] We salute thee, Holy Mary, Daughter of God the Father, and entreat thee to obtain for us a devotion like thine own to the Most Sweet Will of God.

We salute thee, Virgin Mother of God the Son, and entreat thee to obtain for us such union with the Sacred Heart of Jesus, that our own hearts may burn with love for God, and an ardent zeal for the salvation of souls.

We salute thee, Immaculate Spouse of God the Holy Ghost, and entreat thee to obtain for us such yielding of ourselves to the Blessed Spirit, that He may in all things direct and rule our hearts, and that we may never grieve Him in thought, word, or deed. (This prayer has an indulgence of 300 days.)

There is also a "Consecration to Our Lady of the Atonement" indulgenced under date of April 23, 1948, and a Litany of Our Lady of the Atonement approved for private devotion.

[11] Sermon for feast of Our Lady of the Atonement, n. d.

[12] *Ibid.*

Mother under that title, let us think of her as 'Our Lady of Unity,' and let us consecrate ourselves afresh at her altar to contribute what lies within our power of prayer, sacrifice, and charitable endeavor to bring our separated brethren into the unity of the One Fold under the One Shepherd."[13]

For just as the devil draws an individual person to sin, separating him from Christ, removing that unity of Christ and the soul, so also has he brought schism and heresy and indifferentism by which millions are cut off from unity with the Redeemer. However, Father Paul confidently predicted Mary's victory over the powers of hell: "Satan by fomenting strife and fostering heresy and schism has separated many millions from the unity of the Church . . . but Our Lady of the Atonement will yet crush the serpent's head even where he has until now achieved his greatest victories."[14] He went on to add:

> Through her all prevailing intercession the Holy Spirit will bring about such a world-wide movement of dissident Christians to the center of Catholic Unity that the return of the Wandering Sheep to communion with the Apostolic See will far transcend in magnitude and importance the lapse of the Greeks from Unity in the tenth century and the Protestant defection in the sixteenth century combined. We dare to make this prophecy not because we have the vision of the Seer but because we believe that God the Father Almighty will answer the prayer of His Son, Jesus Christ, and Our Lady of the Atonement will have a leading part to play in this glorious accomplishment.[15]

As founder and promoter of the Chair of Unity Octave annually observed from January 18th to the 25th, Father Paul was especially fond of speaking of Mary's intercessory power during this period of special prayer for the conversion of the world. He asked the faithful to say the rosary daily, or at least one decade of it, for the unity of all men in Christ. Then on her feast day he once said: "Let us then—and we cannot stress it too often—invoke and make known Our Lady of the Atonement as Shepherdess of the Wandering Sheep and Pillar of Unity. Let us never doubt that by her powerful assistance, and with our cooperation, she will draw them back into unity with God and with each other in the One, Holy,

[13] *Lamp*, 21, 2 (March, 1926), 93.
[14] *Ibid.*
[15] *Ibid.*

Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church."[16] Elsewhere he pointed out Mary's love for her children outside the Church:

> When, therefore, we address the Blessed Virgin as Our Lady of the Atonement, we conceive her to be our Mother and we her Atonement Children. Nor, because we are Catholics do we assert that she is the Mother of Catholics only; she is the mother of all the baptized, whether they be within the fold of Peter or belong to the "other sheep" mentioned by the Good Shepherd, abroad in the desert places of heresy and schism, yet dear to Jesus and to the Mother heart of Mary.[17]

Father Paul believed that Mary as the new Eve, the Mother of all the living in the Mystical Body of Christ, would have a special part to play in the final unity of men in the Church. He said that since Our Lady was so completely united to God herself she was a symbol of that unity which men should enjoy with their Lord. He phrased his thought in this fashion: "When we . . . give to our Blessed Mother the title of Our Lady of the Atonement we mean: Our Lady of Unity. As she sits enthroned she represents to the universe the highest possible approach of a creature to intimate and exalted union with God. . . . But Our Lady of the Atonement is not alone the Mother of God, she is also the new Eve, the Mother of redeemed mankind; she is the center of that family unity which Christ prayed and willed might flourish among his Sons and Daughters of the Atonement."[18] On another occasion he urged his audience to have recourse to Mary that those outside the fold might come to know the Holy Father as Our Lord's Vicar.

> Let us look up to her all radiant on her throne, our beautiful Mother of the Atonement, apparelled in the crimson robe of the Precious Blood, interceding at this moment for the great At-one-ment; and may we never cease to unite our prayers with hers that the scales may fall away from the eyes of our separated brethren and that they may understand that the Great Shepherd whom Our Father appointed as His Vicegerent on earth is *their* Father and *their* shepherd.[19]

Such is a brief summary of Father Paul's teaching on Our Lady of the Atonement. It might be called a single concept: salvation

[16] Sermon of 1930. See *Lamp*, 28, 10 (November, 1930), 321.
[17] *Ibid.*
[18] *Lamp*, 24, 1 (February, 1926), 60.
[19] *Lamp*, 28, 10 (November, 1930), 323.

through Mary's intercession, with a dual aspect: Mary's role in Calvary's sacrifice and her part in the extension of Calvary, by which men are brought to that unity of faith, worship, and government in the Church. The idea is not new, but Father Paul gave it special emphasis because of his love for Mary and because of his love for the Church and his desire to see men attain salvation.

The word used for Atonement is *adunatio* (*ad-unatio*) and while it might grate upon a latinist's ear, still it seems to express very well the notion of the Atonement, i.e., the making at-one of man and God through the satisfaction of Christ upon the cross. At any rate, the Latin phrase for Our Lady of the Atonement is *Domina nostra Adunationis* and so it is used in the Society of the Atonement. The Mass and Office for the feast of Our Lady of the Atonement, approved in 1948, combine this idea of the sacrifice of Calvary and unity. Thus the lessons of the second nocturn come from the feast of Our Lady of Sorrows (September 15), the famous words of St. Bernard about Mary's spiritual martyrdom, while the third nocturn presents a passage from Christ's prayer of unity as recorded by St. John in his seventeenth chapter; the commentary is that of St. Augustine. In the Mass the *oratio* asks Our Lady to pray for unity,[20] while the lesson is from Judith.[21] These words were first uttered by the grateful inhabitants of Bethulia after Judith had slain their enemy, Holofernes. But the valiant woman was only a type of another daughter of Israel through whom God did so much to save the human race and to whom men pray in their necessities. The gospel for the feast agrees with that of the third nocturn and so comes from the seventeenth chapter of St. John.

In the providence of God it may well be that this new title for Our Lady is to stress her special office in the work of Catholic Unity, in bringing men to the Church of Christ. For if all graces come through Mary, as St. Bernard and other saints assert, then surely the grace of participating in the God-given unity which the Church alone possesses comes through the motherly hands of the Virgin Mary. In his letter to the English people, *Amantissimae*

[20] "Deus, qui dispersos congregas et congregatos conservas: quaesumus, ut, per intercessionem beatissimae Virginis Mariae, super Ecclesiam tuam unionis gratiam clementer infundas."

[21] *Judith* 13:22-25.

voluntatis, Pope Leo composed a prayer for the return of those outside the fold, with Our Lady standing by the Cross. Surely what he said of one Protestant body and Mary's prayers for it may with equal fitness be applied to others. The prayer is the following:

> O Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God and our most gentle Queen and Mother, look down in mercy upon England thy "dowry" and upon us all who greatly hope and trust in thee. By thee it was that Jesus our Saviour and our hope was given to the world; and He has given thee to us that we might hope still more. Plead for us, thy children, whom thou didst receive and accept at the foot of the Cross. O sorrowful Mother! intercede for our separated brethren that they may be united with us in the one true fold to the Supreme Shepherd, the Vicar of Thy Son. Pray for us, dear Mother, that by faith fruitful in good works we may all deserve to see and praise God, together with thee in our heavenly home.[22]

It is also noteworthy that Father D'Alzon, founder of the Augustinians of the Assumption, organized a confraternity of prayer for Christian unity under the patronage of Our Lady of Sorrows. Later this was made a primary archconfraternity by Pope Leo XIII in 1898 and placed under the patronage of Our Lady of the Assumption, but it still holds place in the crusade of prayers for unity.

In the light of present day theological study about Our Lady, her participation in the sacrifice of Calvary and thus her function in the Church take on new meaning and prominence. Though Mary has long been called Co-Redemptrix, Reparatrix, Salvatrix, Conciliatrix, and similar titles,[23] in recent times her role in the scheme of salvation has brought greater study than ever before. Statements of the Popes have become classical in Mariology, especially those of Leo XIII, Pius X, and Benedict XV. Perhaps it is the beginning of uncovering new gems of theological lore, e.g., the relation between Mary and the Church. Mathias Scheeben has put forth a statement that is surely provocative of much investigation:

> In general, there exists between Mary's motherhood and that of the Church so close, complete, and mutual a relation, rather so intrinsic a

---

[22] *Acta Sancta Sedis,* XXVII (April 27, 1895), 593.

[23] See C. Frietoff, *De alma Socia Christi Mediatoris* (Rome, 1936), pp. 37 ff.

connection and likeness that one can be known only in and with each other. The two are connected and resemble each other by the very fact that they depend upon the Holy Spirit for their fecundity and life, and are thereby intended to communicate a holy and spiritual life. In both cases, moreover, the spiritual motherhood over the redeemed includes a motherhood over Christ Himself and indeed owes its perfection to this factor. For, all other maternal functions of the Church centre round that by which She brings forth in Her womb the Eucharistic Christ as Head, the sacrifice, and the food of the members of His mystical body. But the very fact reveals very specially the more sublime and fundamental character of Mary's motherhood in comparison with that of the Church, and at the same time the organic connection between the two, as a result of which the Church's maternal activity is exerted because of and by virtue of Mary's motherhood while Mary carries on her maternal work in and through the Church.[24]

This idea of Mary's position in the Church, of her role in uniting men to Christ, and hence the fitness of her being called Our Lady of Unity is not new. St. Augustine states that Mary "is Mother spiritually of the members of our Head; that is of us, because *by her charity* she cooperated in bringing about in the Church the birth of the faithful who are members of the head, while bodily she is the Mother of the Head Himself."[25] Elsewhere he uses the title *Mater unitatis*.[26] St. Cyril of Alexandria speaks of the place of Mary in his sermon preached at the Council of Ephesus: ". . . Hail Mary, Mother of God . . . by whom every creature is brought to the knowledge of the truth, by whom holy baptism and the oil of exultation reach the faithful, by whom churches are established the world over, by whom nations are brought to penance; what more shall I say—by whom the only begotten Son of God enlightened those who were sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death. . . ."[27]

Some mediaeval writers have spoken of Mary as uniting the

[24] *Mariology*, 2 v. (St. Louis, 1947), 2, 250-1.

[25] *De sancta virginitate*.

[26] "Caput vestrum perperit Maria, vos Ecclesia. Nam ipsa quoque et mater et virgo est; mater visceribus caritatis, virgo integritate fidei et pietatis. Populos parit, sed unius membra sunt, cuius ipsa corpus et coniunx, etiam in hoc simulitudinem gerens illius Virginis, qui et in multis est mater unitatis." Sermo 192. Migne, *PL* 38:1012.

[27] *Hom.* 4, Migne, *Patrologia, series graeca*, 77:992.

Head to the Body, Christ to the Church, the Bridegroom to the Spouse;[28] all men are united in her chamber, i.e., in her womb;[29] and she united those who are separated and holds those who are joined to the Church.[30] Gerohus Reichersbergensis declares: "Mary is the Mother of the Apostles, of whom it was said to one: Behold thy Mother. That which was said to one was said to all the Apostles and fathers of the Church. And because Christ prayed for those who would believe through their word that they all may be one (*ut omnes unum sint*), it was said to all the faithful who loved Christ with all their hearts."[31]

For us it seems that the title of Our Lady of the Atonement has theological and devotional implications which may add new lustre to the glories of the Queen of heaven and earth. Whether in generations to come this feast should be extended to the universal Church we do not know, but what is far more important is the recognition of Our Lady in the work of reconciling God and man, in the regeneration of the Children of God. For as Blessed Pius X has said: "There is no more certain way of uniting men to Christ than Mary." But whatever be the designs of God for the future, time and circumstances will tell; such is His way. It is for men now to realize Mary's role in the whole scheme of salvation, in the achievement of the mission of the Church. It is their duty and their high calling to beseech Mary with confidence and love with the following thought, if not the actual words: "Our Lady of the Atonement intercede for us, that the prayer of your Divine Son may be fulfilled: 'that all may be one.'"

TITUS CRANNY, S.A.

Atonement Seminary
Washington, D. C.

[28] "Unit caput corpori, Christum Ecclesiae, Sponsum Sponsae." Amadeus Lausannensis, *Hom.* 3, *PL* 188:1311.

[29] ". . . coadunat in thalamo suo." Herman of Tournai, *PL* 180:34.

[30] ". . . disiunctos iungit, iunctos retinet." *Ibid.*

[31] *Sermo 46 de S. Joannis Evang. PL* 144:868.

A NEW HISTORICAL PROJECT: EDITING THE PAPERS OF ARCHBISHOP JOHN CARROLL

In recent years the publication of the writings of famous founding fathers of the American Republic, as well as of other moulders of the national character, has come to enjoy widespread popularity. The editing and printing for the general public, as well as for historical scholars, of the writings, speeches, and even private letters of important Americans was not unknown in the last century. Almost 120 years ago Jared Sparks, the noted Harvard historian, edited—albeit with terrible textual tampering—the writings of George Washington in twelve volumes. By the early 1890's Worthington C. Ford had redone the job in fifteen volumes, and then in 1932 thirty-nine volumes were edited by John C. Fitzpatrick, a former president of the American Catholic Historical Association, for the bicentennial of the first President. This latter project was somewhat unique since it was so thorough a work and was financed by the government. It is true that as early as 1778 the federal government had authorized the publication of state papers, and even supported incomplete editions of papers of such men as Hamilton, Jefferson and Madison, but the Washington publication mentioned above came at a time when such documentary works had little popular appeal and were thought to be in good measure unprofitable.[1]

The Catholic pattern of activity in documentary publication—where it existed at all—followed the general American development. The most ambitious editions of the nineteenth century were those of the works of Bishop John England of Charleston in 1849 (which was repeated in 1908) and of the writings of Orestes Brownson.[2] Archbishop John Hughes of New York was fortu-

[1] The National Historical Publications Commission, *A National Program for the Publication of the Papers of American Leaders. A Preliminary Report to the President of the United States* (Washington, 1951), pp. 2-3; John C. Fitzpatrick (Ed.), *The Writings of George Washington,* I (Washington, 1931), xxxv f.

[2] Sebastian Messmer *et al.* (Editors), *The Works of the Right Reverend John England* (Cleveland, 7 volumes, Arthur H. Clark Co., 1908); Ignatius Aloysius Reynolds (Ed.), *The Works of the Right Rev. John England, First Bishop of Charleston* (Baltimore, 5 volumes, John Murphy & Co.,

nate, too, in having Lawrence Kehoe shortly after his death collect many of his public letters, speeches, and other writings into two volumes that have proved highly serviceable to the historians of American Catholicism.[3] Since the turn of the century there has been nothing in Catholic circles to compare with these except an occasional collection of public statements of prominent ecclesiastics.[4]

Up to now the publication of source materials pertaining to American Catholic history, outside of those printed in scholarly periodicals, has not been executed according to exacting editorial standards. No attempt was made to cover all the writings of the men involved, and particularly notable among the missing materials were their personal letters. At times what was even remotely apt to offend certain readers was elided and that usually with no indication that anything had been dropped. The place of origin of much of the material printed remain un-noted and, of course, allusions within the texts went unexplained. Many of these defects—for such they would be considered today—occurred because of the inaccessibility of materials as well as of the closeness of editors to the times and persons alluded to in the documents. A general lack of interest, or at least a scale of values which weighed heavily toward the practical, has left a real deficiency in materials that might otherwise have been printed over the years. An obvious case is that of diocesan pastoral letters, announcements, and other public statements which in sees like the Archdioceses of Quebec

---

1849); Henry F. Brownson (Ed.), *Works of Orestes A. Brownson* (Detroit, 20 volumes, Henry F. Brownson, 1882-1887).

[3] Laurence Kehoe, *The Complete Works of the Most Rev. John Hughes, D.D., Archbishop of New York. Comprising His Sermons, Letters, Lectures, Speeches, etc. Carefully Compiled and Edited from the Best Sources* (New York, 2 volumes, The American News Company, 1864). These also appeared under the imprint of the Catholic Publication House in the same year and a revised and corrected edition was published in the next two years.

[4] For example, James Cardinal Gibbons, *Retrospect of Fifty Years* (Baltimore, 2 volumes, John Murphy, 1916); John Ireland, *The Church and Modern Society. Lectures and Addresses* (I, Chicago, D. H. McBride, 1897; II, St. Paul, Pioneer Press, 1904). Happily the collective voice of the whole hierarchy has been preserved in documentary form in Peter Guilday (Ed.) *The National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy, 1791-1919* (Washington, 1923), and in its present continuation, Raphael M. Huber (Ed.), *Our Bishops Speak* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1952).

and Montreal have been officially and regularly published but which in the United States have been badly neglected.[5]

At times of external crisis and of internal weakness it is not surprising to find nations, like individuals, turning to their past and to the papers in which former experiences have been preserved. So it was that in 1943 the New York *Times,* which over the years has fostered the wider study of American history, joined its financial resources to the resources and scholarly objectives of Princeton University for the purpose of publishing the writings of Thomas Jefferson in an estimated fifty-two volumes. This project, now well under way with five volumes already issued, has become a model of its kind and has, in fact, served as a point of departure for much of the general interest in similar programs.[6] On May 17, 1950 at a ceremony held at the Library of Congress there was presented to Harry S. Truman the first volume in that series. The history-reading President announced on this occasion his support and endorsement of a broad program of publication which would include the papers of other American leaders, not only in politics but in all walks of life. The President at that time did not mention explicitly religious leaders among those whose contributions to American democracy made their words memorable enough to be enshrined in accessible print for posterity. But on this point the American Catholic Historical Association soon received reassuring word from Dr. Philip M. Hamer, executive director of the National Historical Publications Commission of the National Archives, to whose group the immediate task had been entrusted. Thus the American government, although years behind European countries and our Latin American neighbors where government publications include so much of a cultural and scholarly nature, further committed itself to at least fostering, and even possibly the giving of financial support to documentary publications of private papers.[7]

[5] The Archdiocese of Montreal has recently published the twentieth volume in its series, *Mandements, lettres pastorales, circulaires et autres documents publiés dans le Diocese de Montréal depuis son érection.*

[6] Cf. Lyman H. Butterfield, "The Papers of Thomas Jefferson: Progress and Procedures in the Enterprise at Princeton," *The American Archivist,* XII (April, 1949), 131-145.

[7] Cf. letter of Harry S. Truman to Jess Larson, Washington, June 16, 1951, quoted in *A National Program,* pp. vii-viii.

The interested governmental arm in this endeavor continues to be the National Historical Publications Commission. This agency in the summer and fall of 1950 undertook first to investigate the reactions to the plan of American scholars. Despite differences of opinion as to the extent that government money should be sought for such editing projects, most of the interested parties were in agreement that the scholarly printing of primary sources was a valuable investment for the country. The commission was specifically directed by the Federal Records Act of 1950 to "cooperate with and encourage appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies and nongovernmental institutions, societies, and individuals . . . in editing and publishing the papers of outstanding citizens of the United States. . . ."[8]

The American Catholic Historical Association has been in contact with the commission from the outset. This national Catholic society for those in the historical craft made its recommendations to the federal group concerning representative Catholic men in American history. When the preliminary list of sixty-six names—drawn mostly from the earlier period of American history and the first list recommended by the N.H.P.C. as worthy of special consideration in the publication program—was issued it carried the name of Archbishop John Carroll (1735-1815). Only on a second list were further Catholic names found, such as Roger B. Taney (1777-1864), Alfred E. Smith (1873-1944), and Thomas J. Walsh (1859-1933). The name of James Cardinal Gibbons was at first given a place but was removed before the final printing.[9]

The move of the American Catholic Historical Association in promoting Carroll's cause was followed by further action. The association also undertook to endorse the choice of a western representative whom some non-Catholics, too, felt had been neglected in the commission's listing, namely, Fray Junipero Serra, O.F.M. The Academy of American Franciscan History, which is in the process of editing Serra's letters, was brought into contact with the N.H.P.C. in the hope of giving the publication a national backing.[10] In regard to the father of the American hierarchy, however, it was fitting that the country's organization

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 24, 47; *The American Archivist*, XIV (October, 1951), 371.
[10] *Catholic Historical Review*, XXXVII (January, 1952), 481.

for the fostering of the study of Catholic history should be interested in making his thoughts and words more accessible. Consequently the executive council of the A.C.H.A. at the Christmas week meeting of 1951 in New York appointed a Committee on the John Carroll Papers and approved the expenditure of $1,000 to cover initial expenses. This group is under the chairmanship of the Reverend John Tracy Ellis, Professor of American Church History in the Catholic University of America, and includes *ex officio* the incumbent president of the association, Professor Raymond J. Sontag of the University of California. Other members are Charles H. Metzger, S.J., of West Baden College, Indiana, the author of *The Quebec Act. A Primary Cause of the American Revolution* (New York, 1936) and of many articles on Catholics in that period of our history, and Dr. Annabelle M. Melville of St. Joseph College, Emmitsburg, Maryland, who recently published the biography, *Elizabeth Bayley Seton* (New York, 1951). The secretary of the committee is the present writer, who as the one in charge of the Department of Archives and Manuscripts at the Catholic University of America, will be responsible for the physical collecting and centralizing of the work. There has been consultation with the national commission and the Carroll project has become one of five new undertakings that have already been recognized as coming within the framework of the nation-wide program.[11]

The publication of the papers of Archbishop Carroll in accordance with modern standards involves a wide-sweeping collection of materials and an exacting editorial procedure. Items have already been gathered in facsimile from the Archdiocese of Quebec, Georgetown University, the University of Notre Dame, the Maryland Historical Society, and St. Joseph Central House of the Daughters of Charity at Emmitsburg, Maryland. Other groups are likewise co-operating, the most important of which is, of course, the Archdiocese of Baltimore. Through the good graces of Archbishop Francis P. Keough and the co-operation of the archdiocesan archivist, the Reverend Paul L. Love, the most important body of Carroll Papers is being made available in

[11] *Ibid.*, XXXVIII (April, 1952), 481. Paper of Dr. Hamer, meeting of Mississippi Valley Historical Association, Chicago, April 18, 1952.

photo-copies. Jesuit archives in England have also been contacted for Carroll letters. Already preserved at the pontifical university in Washington, D. C., were copies of Carroll materials gathered in Rome and elsewhere by the late Monsignor Peter Guilday whose biography, *The Life and Times of John Carroll,* appeared in 1922. Some letters of John Carroll, like those of most figures of the colonial and revolutionary period, have remained also in private hands. Three such items have already been made available by the Lee family of Washington, D. C., descendants of Governor Thomas Sim Lee, the Catholic governor of revolutionary Maryland and a friend of Carroll's. It is virtually certain that other such manuscript treasures exist in family hands or among collectors. These are the hardest to ferret out, and any information leading to the tracking down of any such item and its eventual copying will be much appreciated by the Committee on the John Carroll Papers of the A.C.H.A.

Once the papers—or more accurately the facsimiles of letters, sermons, newspaper articles, etc.—are assembled and filed chronologically with controlling indices under date, name and number of accession, the work of editing may begin. Modern norms are reasonable in their guidance for the transfer of original handwritten documents to the printed page. They permit a wider margin for silent correction than would ever be tolerated for a medieval manuscript.[12] In the matter of explaining allusions, nonetheless, they are demanding. An illustration will in all likelihood make this clearer than many words of explanation. The following letter of John Carroll with its editorial notes, prepared for the greater part by Dr. Melville, was presented in the original by the Catholic University of America to its Chancellor, Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle, on December 8, 1951. Archbishop O'Boyle has since made a gift of it to the Archbishop Carroll High School in Washington, D. C. Below is the text in modernized printed form, dropping superscript letters and carrying only the author's final corrected wording but retaining, for the most part, his spelling, capitalization, and punctuation.

12 Cf. for the best discussions of scope and method of modern American editing, L. H. Butterfield (Ed.), *Letters of Benjamin Rush,* I (Princeton, 1951), lxxiv-lxxx and Julian P. Boyd (Ed.), *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson,* I (Princeton, 1950), xxv-xliii.

Balte Aug. 18-1809

My dear Elizabeth—

Mr. Ringold[13] having promised to give me notice of his return from Havre de Grace, and expecting, that it will be tomorrow, I begin in time to get ready for that good opportunity. Your welcome favour by him only preceded the subsequent one of [the date was not inserted] by the mail, which was received within a few hours after the first. After spending a day and half with Mr. Bitouzey,[14] I came safe indeed, and well to Baltimore, but tired with driving, and whipping the horse kindly lent by Mr. Ths. Lee.[15] One of my first visits was to Mrs. Turnbull,[16] whom I found in perfect health; your favourite little Mary was, and is still out of town. Louisa[17] I have not seen; she has been ever since at the manor, and at this time alone with Aunt Harper.[18] Mrs. Caton[19] and others assure me, that Louisa speaks with rapture and gratitude of her entertainment at Washington and particularly of the perfect freedom, which reigns in our Sister's family; and she might add, which she took without reserve. She has, as her Mother says, been sick *indeed* for some days, since she returned; and I hope, has resumed her exercises of piety, and was at her duties on the 15th, Mr. Perigny[20] being then at the manor. I heard just now that two of Molly's [21] best visiting friends, Mesdames Erskine and (Robt)

[13] This manuscript is addressed "Robt Brent Esqr. Paymaster Genl. Washington Favd by Tench Ringold Esqr." Ringold, a resident of Washington, six years later was serving as commissioner of public buildings in the District of Columbia.

[14] Germain Barnaby Bitouzey, S.J., was in charge of the Jesuit house at Whitemarsh from 1801 to 1813.

[15] Thomas Sim Lee had been governor of Maryland during the Revolution, served in Congress under the Articles of Confederation and in the Constitutional Convention of 1787.

[16] This is most likely Mrs. Sarah Turnbull, a sixty-two-year-old Baltimore widow.

[17] Louisa Caton, daughter of Mary Carroll and Richard Caton, because of her beauty was known as one of the "Three American Graces." After marrying an aide to the Duke of Wellington in 1817 she subsequently married two other members of the English nobility after being widowed twice.

[18] Aunt Harper was Mrs. Robert Goodloe Harper, the former "Kitty" or Catherine Carroll, and sister of Mary Carroll Caton.

[19] Mrs. Caton was Mary or "Polly" Carroll, daughter of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, who married Richard Caton in 1786.

[20] Abbé Georges de Perrigny, a priest from San Domingo, who stayed at Doughoregan Manor, the Carroll estate. He served as librarian of the Library Company of Baltimore for fifteen years during the presidency of Bishop Carroll.

[21] Molly was Mary Carroll Young, the bishop's sister, who had married Notley Young, the owner of extensive properties in the District of Columbia.

Smith[22] came up yesterday. I go to dine today in the country with C. C. Jr., where his Fr.[23] is likewise to be; & if Charles has had timely notice, perhaps Mr. Erskine; tho I wish not, for it will make dinner, and consequently riding home very late. Old Mary's[24] recovery will make a memorable instance in favour of temperance. The venerable Mr. Nagot, Superior of the Seminary and of all the Sulpicians here,[25] is to all appearances closing his most holy life. I go to see & be edified by him every day.

Aug. 19. Mr. Erskine was not with us, so we dined not extravagantly late. He is to remain at lodgings in the neighborhood of this city, till Mr. Jackson[26] arrives. Mrs. Caton, Betsy, and Emily[27] came from Brooklyn with the old gentleman to join us; the two former return back today; and Mr. C. C. of C.[28] goes to the manor. I wish you were all with me today, or I with you having received a present of a fine sea turtle, which would make a fine Saturday dinner for us and a dozen more. Mr. Nagot was better last night. Your account of the progress of our nephews under their Governor Lewis,[29] and of

---

[22] Mrs. Erskine was the American wife of David Erskine, the British minister to the United States in 1809. Following the *Chesapeake* affair Erskine had reached an agreement with Secretary of State Robert Smith which exceeded Erskine's instructions from George Canning, British Foreign Minister. Canning thereupon repudiated Erskine and replaced him with Francis James Jackson. Mrs. Smith was the wife of James Madison's inefficient head of the state department.

[23] C. C., Jr. was Charles Carroll, the son of Mary Darnell and Charles Carroll of Carrollton, the signer of the Declaration of Independence. The latter and the bishop were distant cousins and had known each other since school days at Bohemia Manor in Maryland and St. Omer's in Flanders. They had gone on a mission to Canada in 1776 for the Continental Congress with Benjamin Franklin and Samuel Chase.

[24] Old Mary was a servant given to over-indulgence in spirituous liquors.

[25] Charles Francis Nagot, formerly the vice-rector of the Grand Seminary of St. Sulpice in France, had met Bishop Carroll in London following Carroll's consecration. Nagot went to Baltimore to lay the foundations of St. Mary's Seminary and remained head of that institution till his resignation in 1810. In August, 1809 Nagot was very ill, but not mortally so.

[26] Erskine's successor as British minister to the United States was known as "Copenhagen Jackson" because he had given the ultimatum which led to the seizure of the Danish fleet in 1807. Jackson's anti-American attitude led to his recall after a year in the United States.

[27] Betsy, or Elizabeth, Caton was another of the beautiful daughters who married a British baron, while Emily the fourth and last sister married a John McTavish who served as British consul in Baltimore from the 1830's.

[28] Charles Carroll of Carrollton.

[29] It is impossible to identify positively these nephews and their tutor, but

their health is very pleasing. If Mr. Livingston[30] has serious thoughts of any of our nieces, his politeness to the b[rothe]r and cousin will secure their interest in his behalf: but terrifying is the idea of a young woman being seated down in the hotbed of presbyterianism, at least one hundred miles from a Catholic church or clergyman, or perhaps the habitation of a Catholic. No worldly advantage or satisfaction, even if it were to be as real, as it is often only a delusive imagination, can make compensation for this evil. You have heard without doubt of Mr. Oakley having transferred his attentions to Mde. Bonaparte,[31] and of their being well received, as is generally supposed. Some go so far, as to declare, that they will be married. The famous Major Thomas[32] was an object of ridicule, during his stay here. They say that being discarded by Louisa, he immediately turned to Betsy. Casting my eyes over the past lines, I am led to reflect on the effects of habit, and of the tinge which our company gives to our conversation. During my stay at Washington, having heard so much of Oakley, Thomas, &c, &c, no wonder that they fill up a part of my letter. I shall rejoice to hear of the progress of your house, and of its being finished, and of your having had a sufficient share of the salutary rains of the past and this week.

[I am] truly sorry for the slow progress of little Maria Carroll's[33]

---

they may have been Brent boys, sons of Daniel Brent, the bishop's nephew who had a position with the government.

[30] This was most likely Robert Leroy Livingston of Hudson, New York, who was a representative in Congress from 1809 to 1811 and married eventually Maria Diggs of Washington who was related to the Carroll family.

[31] Madame Bonaparte was Eliza Patterson Bonaparte, the daughter of William Patterson and Dorcas Spear. Jerome Bonaparte, the younger brother of the First Consul, had arrived in Baltimore in September, 1803, at the age of nineteen and after a whirlwind courtship he had married Eliza Patterson in the presence of Bishop Carroll although she was a Presbyterian. Napoleon refused to accept his brother's marriage and the couple were refused admission to France in 1804 so that Eliza's son Jerome was born in England in July, 1805. When Pope Pius VII refused to annul the marriage in 1806 the French Emperor took matters into his own hands. Jerome then married Catherine of Wurttenberg, was made King of Westphalia, and Napoleon settled on Eliza Patterson a pension of 60,000 francs. In the light of her social position the Mr. Oakley concerned was likely Charles Oakley who in 1809 was Secretary of the British Legation.

[32] The "famous Major" may have been Philemon Thomas, the soldier and political leader who in 1810 led the West Florida insurrection in favor of the United States.

[33] Maria Carroll cannot be definitely identified. She may be either of two

recovery, if indeed there be any progress. When you assure our other friends of my love, do not omit Mr. Carroll's family, especially Anny and Nora. Mr. Ringold will carry himself my affectionate remembrance to his incomparable Lady. Would the Mayor[34] obey my injunctions, if I, John Abp of Baltimore,[35] were to command him to keep house till his ankle is well? I am with my usual, or perhaps increasing affection, D[ea]r El[izabe]th and Mary,

Your aff[ectiona]te B[rothe]r

✠ J. B[isho]p of B[altimo]re

This manuscript item of Archbishop John Carroll demonstrates the amount of editorial work that may be involved in the publication of a single document. At the same time it points up the archbishop's very human qualities and his position in the American society of his time. Contrary to the opinions of some ranting orators of the present day, this one manuscript is enough to show how well Carroll "belonged." His was not an apologetic, shrinking, or merely tolerated, position.

It can be reasonably hoped, therefore, that from the papers of John Carroll there may come a new insight, not only into the history of the Church in the United States, but even into the history of our national life, in the development of which the patriot-bishop moved so naturally and so gracefully.

HENRY J. BROWNE

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

---

girls of the same name who were daughters of the grandsons of the bishop's brother Daniel.

[34] The Mayor was Mayor Robert Brent of Washington, D. C., the son of Robert Brent of Woodstock and Ann Carroll, the bishop's sister. Brent was married to Mary Young, the daughter of Notley Young and the bishop's sister, Mary Carroll.

[35] Carroll used the title of archbishop because the Holy See had created four new bishoprics in 1808. Only one of these new sees was officially filled and that by the consecration in Rome of Luke Concanen, O.P., for New York. Jean Cheverus of Boston, Michael Egan of Philadelphia and Benedict Flaget of Bardstown were not consecrated until 1810. Because Concanen never reached his see Carroll continued as a rule to speak of himself as "bishop" (see his signature). In this case he is being jocular in calling upon the dignity of his new office to enforce health precautions upon his nephew.

THE STRUCTURE OF PAROCHIAL SOCIETIES

It is traditional in the Catholic Church in America that every parish develops a number of "societies," or formal sub-groupings, through which the more zealous and interested parishioners may carry on the general and specific functions of the Church. There may be a variety of personal and social motives for the maintenance of parish organizations. The lay people may wish to intensify their religious practices, assuage their loneliness, develop their parliamentary abilities, or simply "do something to help the Church."

The motives and objectives of the individuals who join parish organizations do not necessarily and always coincide with those of the teaching Church (the bishop and the parish priests) fostering these organizations. Motives may often be quite personal and non-institutional, while objectives tend to be the "stated ideals" as found in the written constitutions and as expressed on occasion by the priests and the lay leaders.

In briefest form, it may be said that the function of parochial societies is twofold: *(a)* to achieve various group goals and *(b)* to express various personal values. These goals and values may range in kind and degree from the high spirituality of a Nocturnal Adoration Society to the secular competitiveness of a sports group. This is perhaps another way of saying that all human social activities may in some remote or proximate manner be directed to the ultimate purpose of the religious institutions: the sanctification and salvation of souls.

Although there is some empirical evidence to the contrary, Americans are supposed to be quick organizers and quick joiners. Whether or not this is an accepted generalization of urban Americans, it seems to be true of urban Catholics when they are nuclear participants in the parochial system. They find that establishing a parish society, or appointing a committee within the existing society, is a relatively simple procedure. Frequently they seem to think that they have "taken care" of a problem by setting up a committee, but at a subsequent meeting they "discover" that the problem still exists. Father Navagh makes the obvious comment, "the organization of a parish society does not insure its continu-

ance."[1] It may be added that mere continuance is neither the objective of an organization nor a mark of its effectiveness.

In a recent study, Frances Engel says that "the most popular type of parish society seems to be the mass membership organization with considerable membership and rather tenuous enrollment requirements," and that "the traditional Catholic organizational pattern by sex and age was found to predominate in the dioceses studied."[2] These statements indicate a wide faith in that necessity of organizing artificially from the top which satisfies the organizer's sense of orderliness. Many priests, as well as some lay people, seem to feel that the parishioners must be put in clearly defined groups (according to age, sex, and marital status) which have been previously and formally structured, with constitutions and by-laws and an emphasis on the administrative machinery. The formal paper-plan shows in "black-and-white" how all the lay activities should follow a previously arranged pattern. But all of this is at best a preliminary to group activity.

Of course, parochial societies do exist all over the United States, and they do function, but there seems to be danger that organization may become an end in itself. This happens through an overemphasis on the formalized and institutionalized procedures. The active leaders tend to develop perfunctory patterns of behavior and thought because it is easier to maintain the structure than to pursue the function. In other words, the ideal goals of both clergy and lay leaders may often be frustrated by over-institutionalization.

From our study of lay societies in various urban parishes, we have formulated two general conclusions: *(a)* the attempt to include all lay, voluntary, parochial activity into relatively few formal organizations minimizes both effectiveness (achieving purpose) and efficiency (getting people to contribute effort). *(b)* The neglect of informal small groupings (sometimes called "natural groups") constitutes one of the greatest social wastes in the apostolic potential of the parish.

In a comparative survey of twenty-three parishes in the same

[1] Navagh, James J., *The Apostolic Parish*, Kenedy, New York, 1950, p. 117.

[2] See *Sociology of the Parish*, edited by C. J. Nuesse and Thomas Harte, Bruce, Milwaukee, 1951, pp. 201 f.

city, we found that there were an average of 13.2 societies per parish. These included groups of every kind and description which could in any way be identified as *parochial*. If we omit the groups made up of elementary school children (Scouts, Altar Boys, Children of Mary, etc.) we may estimate the numerical membership of societies in proportion to the number of parishioners fourteen years of age and older. In going through the roll calls and minutes of meetings of these organizations, we eliminated the names of those who attended less than one-third of the meetings, or who participated in no way in their society during the year. By this definition the practical and active membership of the parish societies averaged a little more than 142 persons per parish, or approximately 3.6 per cent of the parishioners who are fourteen years of age and older.

Priests interviewed in these parishes recognized and deplored the small numbers of active parishioners. Some of them remarked that "there is always a handful of lay people in every parish who do all the work," a statement which seems to be true of most voluntary groupings, religious or secular. There appears to be also a handful of families which supplies the core of people around whom the lay parochial organizations revolve. In a separate survey we found that the greatest proportion of younger members of parish societies are found in families where the father and/or the mother are also active in the parish societies.

Often, the parish priests realistically and resignedly accept this fact of minimum lay participation as a universal, natural situation about which little can be done. They had concentrated much thought and energy on the various formal organizations and had "built them up" at one time or another during their parochial experience. But the groups do not remain "built up" nor do they flourish simultaneously. When asked why they maintain the present system of relatively few formal organizations, the priests reply that this is the only way in which parochial unity could be preserved and proper direction can be given. In other words, they feel that a multiplication of societies would bring division among the parishioners and would make it impossible for the priests to moderate the lay activity.

On the other hand, it appears that the unity of the parish is sometimes threatened by over-organization. The priests—probably

subconsciously—tend to regard organization members as first-class parishioners, the loyal and faithful few on whom they can depend. By contrast, those who were unwilling or unable to join the parish societies are relegated to a kind of second-class status.[3] This does not imply that the priests are ever unkind or brusque with non-participants of these groups. It seems to be a lack of attention rather than any positive attitude, statement or action, which brings about this feeling of separation.

In a quiet, sub-surface way, there seems to be rivalry among the various organizations existing in any particular urban parish. This is to some extent due to the priests' demonstration (or lack) of interest in one rather than another group. The young assistant priest may take a more active part in the Altar Boys than in the Sodality or the athletic teams. One priest may show greater interest in the Ushers' Society than in the Holy Name, or in the Rosary Society than in the Choir. The active parishioners in these various groups come to consider the structure of their organizations so important that they have to have it recognized *as such.*

The question of authority, the proper direction of lay societies within the parish, is much more complex. When a priest exercises close supervision over a group, the members sometimes feel that they are working *for him,* and that the invaluable quality of lay initiative is being stifled. There are, of course, many parishioners who are "chronic gripers" and who accept neither work nor responsibility in the parish societies. Still, even the most zealous and active parishioners sometimes complain about the priests' interference. This points up what Monsignor Hellriegel has said: "Innumerable efforts and much time are spent by priests on these societies, efforts often that *could be made just as well by non-consecrated hands.*"[4]

One of the clearest and most important conclusions we have made from our parochial research is that the system of cooperative effort in the parish societies is quite different from that of any other kind of social unit. This fact is particularly relevant to the

[3] An exception to this is found in the highly successful businessmen and professional men, who are greatly esteemed by priests and parishioners even though they are almost never active in the parish societies.

[4] At the National Liturgical Week in 1940. See *The Sacramental Way,* edited by Mary Perkins, Sheed and Ward, New York, 1948, p. 205.

authoritative lines of communication extending from the priests to the people through the voluntary organizations. An urban parish cannot be operated like a factory, or a school, or even like a family.

The priests frequently speak of their parishes as "one big happy family." They like to use this figure of speech in meetings of the lay societies, from the pulpit and in private counselling. While the title, *Father*, may imply a paternal attitude, and while the priests may assume such a paternal attitude, the relationship is at best only remotely familial. The urban parish is too large, the contacts are too few, and many of the parishioners do not exhibit a reciprocal filial attitude toward the priests. The urban parish is a secondary grouping, while the family is a primary grouping.

Unlike a school or factory, the parish contains a majority of persons who can refuse to cooperate. "Relatively few parishioners in the majority of the parishes studied are members of parish societies. By and large, parish societies are something of a hit-and-miss proposition which the parishioner can take or leave without any feeling of personal responsibility."[5] The size and structure of parochial societies (as well as the problem of authority) are important elements in this lack of co-operation and this unwillingness to become members.

While a factory may contain five or six thousand persons—like a large parish—the nature of its operation and its structure makes similarity in size relatively unimportant. The factory is in continuous operation and each person performs specific actions for specific ends, is motivated by sanctions and incentives, and is directed by delegated authority which leaves no choice except to obey or resign. The operation and structure of parochial organizations have no advantages of this kind. The function is at best sporadic; it can be initiated, neglected, altered in almost any way which the volunteer workers desire. The priests can exercise their direct control only when the lay participants are positively willing to co-operate.

We have said above that in the urban parish only a small nucleus is so disposed. This nucleus is in essence a clique of families with which the priests can best co-operate. The more outspoken parishioners, who are not members of the inner circle, sometimes talk

[5] Engel, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

about the "clique that's in control." The particularized relation between priests and parishioners refers again to the central problem of lay parochial structure.

Is this nucleus, this handful of faithful parishioners who do all the work, elastic? The answer seems to lie in the multiplication of small nuclei instead of in the expansion of the nucleus into large formal groupings. Our detailed study of the meetings and activities of lay organizations leads to the conclusion that effective co-operation cannot be achieved in groups of more than twelve to fifteen persons. Even in each of the smallest groups, which do not strive for mass membership, the actual work is done by less than ten persons. It is true that on single occasions large numbers of parishioners appear, as at Holy Name Rallies, athletic contests, the May crowning, and so forth, but this is "attendance at" rather than "working with" a lay organization.

The functioning of a lay parochial society undoubtedly requires co-operative effort, but the renewed pleas of the priests for *full co-operation of all the members* of any society goes unheeded. The demonstrable fact is that there is an outer limit to the number of social relationships any person can maintain. The same is true of a cohesive group. With each addition to the group the number of relationships increase geometrically. In a group of six persons there are fifteen relationships; in a group of twelve there are sixty-six. When a group passes beyond its limit of workable relationships it must either proliferate (into sub-committees or separate groups) or resign itself to an increasing number of inactive members.

If this conclusion is valid for any social unit it is even more valid for a group made up of volunteer workers. Of its very nature, the voluntary contribution of effort to a parochial organization inhibits large-scale, long-term co-operation. Many of the problems, with which parish priests are plagued in large formal organizations, may be converted into incentives for work in small informal groupings. A volunteer has pet projects and fads. He may have an exaggerated idea of his own importance, or a desire for local prestige. These are "non-material" incentives for parochial activity even though they cannot be called supernatural motives. As long as he has a few fellow-parishioners who share his ideas and are willing to follow him, he may form a useful group in the parish.

People of this kind are numerous in every urban parish. Personal

interviews reveal that at various times they have "suggested good ideas" to the priests, who "wouldn't listen." They tried to get the floor at meetings, but their ideas were "voted down." As a result they lost interest and complained that "nobody wants to co-operate around here." On the other hand, the priests tend to think of these people as "crackpots." They are the kind of persons who "always want to do things their own way, and if they don't get their own way they quit."

The history of any urban parish probably contains many examples of this failure of both effectiveness and efficiency, with its resultant inactivity. They indicate the truth of the sociological generalization that only a minority of the members of a large-scale unit like a parish are willing to serve and co-operate in any specific organization. Hence if there are only certain restricted channels of expression for them (the several, traditional, large, formal organizations) the number of active participants in these formal groupings will be few. This number of active people can be multiplied only if the number of organizations (or their sub-committees) is multiplied, and only if these are small, natural (not artificial) groupings.

The concept of the natural group, or social clique, has been amply demonstrated in modern sociological research.[6] Even in a factory system people tend to do their best work when the realities of the social system are recognized. The working nucleus must have a social bond of some kind. In the parish it does not seem sufficient to say, "They all have the same religion. They're all Catholics and parishioners, and they ought to work together." A social fact, clearly evident in the urban American parish, is that the religious bond is only one in many. The informal groupings of lay persons actually existing in the community tend to cohere not only around a dominant personality but also around a combination of other elements: ethics, education, sex, age, friendship, residence, kinship, and so forth.

These small informal groups have for the most part only relative permanence. Some may endure for many years, but their membership changes. Some may have shorter duration, for it is the very nature of informal dynamic social life that people regroup themselves from time to time. This mercurial quality of informal

[6] The two classics in this regard are Warner's *The Social Life of a Modern Community*, and Roethlisberger and Dixon's *Management and Morale*.

groupings is considered a defect by many Catholics, both lay and clerical, who have accepted the system of large formal parochial organizations as the only logical kind of structure.

Some of the traditional organizations in the urban parishes exhibit a pride in their long continuing history, but none of them has flourished continuously. Each has had periods of stagnancy and periods of activity. Fluctuations are part of the history of formal organizations; hence, the relative transiency of informal groupings is not necessarily a major argument against their adoption. This is an aspect of the dynamism of parochial life which is emphasized in the prevailing conditions of modern urban areas. Lay parochial societies need not be perennial. There is no reason why they may not be allowed to die when their purpose is accomplished, or when their members lose interest or regroup themselves.

It may be noted in conclusion that one of the greatest obstacles to the restructuring of lay organizations in urban parishes seems to lie in the traditional relationship between priests and people. In most instances initiative and authority lie firmly in the hands of the priests. The principle of self-direction, basic to the modern concept of the organized lay apostolate, runs contrary to this tradition. While Catholic lay action is not separate from and independent of the regularly constituted lines of Church authority, the operation of informal groupings in the parochial structure is impossible without lay responsibility.

Abbé Michonneau complained that the French clergy reduced their parishioners to the status of mere listeners "even in organizations where *they* are supposed to do the talking. . . . They do not give anything; they are passive beings. The parish has become the business of the clergy; it is of no concern to the faithful."[7] This seems to be a valuable note of warning to both clergy and parishioners everywhere.

In the last analysis there is no need to make exclusive alternatives of the large, formal organization on the one hand and the small, informal groupings on the other. A blending of both is possible.[8] The negative features of both may be eliminated and their

[7] Abbé Michonneau, *Revolution in a City Parish*, Blackfriars, London, 1949, p. 22.

[8] The practical technique for working out this "blend" of the two types of organization on the parish level has been suggested as a project for priests' workshops in human relations.

positive elements promoted. The important aspect of any parochial group is its function—demonstrated when people act co-operatively toward worthy goals.

JOSEPH H. FICHTER, S.J.

Loyola University of the South
New Orleans, Louisiana

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for November, 1902, is the conclusion of a series on the rational proof of the immortality of the soul, entitled "Bridging the Grave," from the pen of Fr. A. MacDonald. . . . A lengthy article on the liturgical rules governing Requiem Masses is contributed by a writer who signs himself S. L. E. With great detail he explains the ecclesiastical prescriptions regarding the days when funeral Masses may be celebrated, anniversaries in the strict and in the broad sense, Requiem Masses in cemetery chapels, etc. . . . Fr. J. McSorley, C.S.P., (still living and active) writes on "The Contemplative Life." Of special interest is his reference to the first English biography of the "Little Flower," which had just been published. Speaking of the apostolate exercised by contemplatives, Fr. McSorley says: "The contemplative apostolate is more than a dream; it is divinely real; it is a mighty force perfectly objective, wonderfully efficacious; and if there be any wisdom in the Gospel counsel, any harmony in the teachings of faith, any sincerity in Christ's invitation to prayer, then surely a soul that enters Carmel may be a most precious factor in the continuing of the ministry of Jesus, in the building up of the Kingdom of God." . . . Fr. W. H. Kent, O.S.C., of England, writes on "Hieroglyphic Records and the Bible," giving an account of the success achieved by scholars in deciphering ancient writing, especially by means of the famous Rosetta stone. . . . In the Conference section we are informed that for the gaining of the Dominican indulgences of the Rosary it is not necessary to recite the Apostles' Creed at the beginning and the Gloria Patri at the end of each decade. . . . Dr. James Walsh, writing on "Hygiene of Churches," recommends that all confessionals be thoroughly cleansed once a week by a mop and water, and the grating be washed off with a dilute solution of lye or ammonia, since "the usual unsanitary condition of confessionals constitutes an especially dangerous factor of bad hygiene for priests of delicate health."

F. J. C.

THE SYRO-PHOENICIAN WOMAN

And He arose and departed from there for the district of Tyre and Sidon. And He entered a house, and wanted no one to know it, but He could not keep it secret. For immediately a woman, whose little daughter had an unclean spirit, on hearing of him, came in and fell down at His feet. Now the woman was a Gentile, a Syro-phoenician by birth. And she besought Him to cast the devil out of her daughter. But He said to her: "Let the children have their fill, for it is not fair to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs." But she answered and said to Him: "Yes, Lord; for even the dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs." And He said to her: "Because of this answer, go thy way; the devil has gone out of thy daughter." And when she went to her house, she found the girl lying upon the bed, and the devil gone.[1]

* * * * *

This incident in the Gospel is rich in spiritual lessons. Yet it is one which, perhaps more than any other in Our Lord's life, presents a difficulty to the mind of the devout reader. For the manner of speech adopted by Christ seems unduly severe and harsh, and not at all consistent with the fire of charity and compassion which burned always in His Sacred Heart. It is not that we find difficulty in the fact that Christ could use sharp words which would cut into the conscience and heart of his listeners. For true charity, before all else, is ordered by the supreme norm of God's glory and the good of souls, and not by the sentimental norm of not hurting someone. So, consistent with that supreme and true norm, Christ often used strong, steel-like words which cut deep into the hearts of the hypocritical Scribes and Pharisees. For the Scribes and Pharisees were infected with the worst kind of sin,

[1] *Mark*, 7:24-30. The translation is that of the Confraternity Edition. The parallel passage in *Matt.* 15:21-28 adds the following details which are easily fitted into the account of St. Mark: (a) The woman is a Canaanite who came out of the territory of Tyre and Sidon to meet Christ; (b) Her first request to Christ meets with silence. She repeats the request and the disciples ask Christ to dismiss her; (c) Christ answers: "I was not sent except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel"; (d) She again cries for help; (e) Her faith is praised and at that same moment her daughter is healed.

the sin of pride and spiritual independence. We easily understand why Christ applied the hot iron of verbal cauterization to the festering sore of their sin. It was for the good of their souls if they had but heeded Him. However, in the episode which we are considering it is a poor pagan woman who is the object of the seemingly harsh words. The metaphor adopted by Christ, comparing her to a dog, grates against our sense of how Christ would have acted and spoken in such circumstances. It does not seem to reflect at all the gentle Galilean who was so often and so easily moved to compassion by those who were afflicted and sincerely sought His help. This is especially true in the present case, since the humble woman who followed Him suppliantly appears so guileless and sincere. We understand well enough how the hypocritical Pharisees could, and indeed often did, call the Gentile pagans outcasts and dogs. For in their narrow-minded and selfish pride they regarded carnal descent from Abraham as a sure and quite sufficient guarantee of salvation, while at the same time and by the same token they were inclined to reprobate and exclude from the Messianic Blessings all non-Jews.[2] But even if we exclude from Christ, as we must, the selfish pride and contempt which motivated the Pharisees in the use of such language, we still find it difficult to understand how Christ could even have appropriated the term of comparison itself.

Many commentators, the early ones especially, recognized the harshness of the comparison, admitting, it seems, that Christ accommodated Himself to the current Jewish reference by which the Gentiles in general were called dogs. They attempted to justify the harshness and sting of the expression from the manner in

[2] In line with the statements made, the following quotations are worthy of note:

(a) *Matt.* 3:9, "Do not think to say within yourselves, 'we have Abraham for our father'; for I say to you that God is able out of these stones to raise up children to Abraham."

(b) Midrasch Tillim in Ps. 4: "The Nations of the world (i.e. the Gentiles) are like unto dogs."

(c) Josephus Flavius has David characterize Goliath, the pagan Philistine hero, as a "creature worse than a dog." *Antiq. Jud.* VI, 9, 4.

(d) De Grandmaison remarks that in the Palestinian apochryphal literature of the two centuries before Christ "The Gentiles hardly appear except as either the instrument or the object of the vengeance of Jahveh, his rod or the subject of His pitiless judgments." *Jesus Christ* I, 297.

which Christ uttered it and from the motive which prompted Him to use it, i.e., to draw forth this wonderful expression of faith from a pagan. It must be admitted, however, that such an explanation is not at all adequate or satisfactory. The text and context, if correctly translated and studied in the light of New Testament history, yield an explanation which casts the whole incident in a light which is not only more satisfying but is the only true light. Let us briefly recast the scene.

Our Divine Lord was in upper Galilee, perhaps in Capharnaum. From there He went with His disciples into the region of Tyre and Sidon which was the northern borderline of Galilee. Tyre and Sidon, in fact, were seacoast cities within the territory anciently called Phoenicia, which, in Christ's time, was a part of the Roman province of Syria. Heading in this northwestern direction Christ sought a few days of rest and silence for Himself and His disciples. But He was a Light whose rays could not be hidden. The news of His approach sped ahead of Him and filled the heart of one poor pagan woman with hope. St. Matthew calls her a Canaanite, using the ancient name which the Israelites applied to the first inhabitants of the region. St. Mark refers to her as Syrophoenician, noting Phoenicia as a part of Syria, and he expressly remarks that she was non-Jewish by race and religion, a pagan. But like so many other pagan souls near the border of Galilee she had heard of Galilee's Wonder-worker. She was even familiar enough with Jewish religious hopes to know that this Galilean claimed to be the Christ, the Son of David. She knew that He had been going about doing good and dispensing divine favors. That was enough. Her daughter whom she loved was afflicted with an evil spirit and tormented grievously. She would bury national hatreds and her own pride and meet this Jewish Messiah on the way, to ask His help.[3] Addressing Him as the Jewish Messiah she cried out: "O, Lord, Son of David, have pity on me." At first, absorbed in thought as He walked along, Christ remained silent. Undaunted, the woman began to importune the disciples to intercede for her, which they did. "Send her away, they said, for she

[3] Although under David and Solomon the relations of Israel with Phoenicia were at least outwardly amicable quite the opposite was true in the time of Christ. Josephus says: "Of the Phoenicians the Tyrians seem to be especially hostile towards us." *Contra Apionem* Lib. 1, 14.

crieth after us," that is, give her what she asks and send her away contented because she will continue to beg and will leave us no peace or quiet. That this is the meaning of the disciples' words is evidenced from Christ's response. He refuses for the time being the favor they had asked: "I was not sent except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." In this answer Christ was merely stating that, while He had become incarnate to redeem all men, yet in His personal labors as teacher and worker of miracles it was the will of His Father that He confine His mission to the Jews, leaving the future labors of spreading the Gospel in the world at large to His Apostles and their successors.

But even with this refusal the woman's confidence and courage were not weakened. She followed Him even into the house where He hoped to remain in peace, unknown. She fell down at His feet again, beseeching Him to cast the devil out of her little daughter. Again Jesus refused, this time with a spiritual lesson in His answer: "Let the children first have their fill, for it is not fair to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs." Then came that answer from a heart still filled with unwavering faith and love, an answer which must stir the heart of every listener through the ages even as it stirred the Sacred Heart of Christ: "True, Lord, yet even the dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs." Surely, if the violent bear the kingdom of heaven away, then this was an instance to the point. Such faith and humility and perseverence Jesus could not resist. "O, woman, great is thy faith! be it done to thee as thou wilt." And her daughter was cured at that same moment.

Now for the proper understanding of what Christ actually said and meant let us direct our attention to the original Greek text. Practically all of the standard English translations, Protestant as well as Catholic, are defective. Either they fail altogether or are not consistent in translating the Greek word κυνάριον. This word is the diminutive form of κύων (dog), and means a "little dog" or "puppy." Throughout the whole of the New Testament the word occurs in this diminutive form only in this passage of St. Mark and in the parallel passage of St. Matthew. It is found nowhere in the Septuagint Greek translation of the Old Testament. This fact alone should arouse our curiosity. If St. Mark designedly passes over the very common Greek word κύων which occurs frequently

in both the Old and New Testament writings, and chooses in its stead the diminutive κυνάριον it must have been due to his desire to give a special meaning to our Lord's words which otherwise they would not have.[4] And supposing that Christ spoke to the woman in Aramaic, if the Greek translator rendered the original Aramaic of St. Matthew by purposely choosing the diminutive κυνάριον it must have been because the original Aramaic contained the expression "little dog."[5] Indeed, it is not unlikely that the woman used the koine Greek language in speaking to Christ and that He answered her in the same tongue.[6] In either case, there-

[4] Although in later Byzantine and modern Greek the diminutives often lose their force, this is not true of the Koine New Testament Period. Such a possibility is further ruled out in this passage by the context as demanding a special meaning from the fact that this is the only instance of the use of this diminutive form in the Bible. Thus Blass states that κυνάριον contains a subjective idea and belongs to the special class of "endearing terms." (*Grammar of New Testament Greek*, p. 64). A. T. Robertson is of the same opinion in *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 2nd Edit., p. 155.

[5] A. H. McNeile (*The Gospel according to St. Matthew, in loc.*) is wrong in stating that the Aramaic would have no diminutive. The diminutive in Aramaic, as in most Semitic languages, was formed by adding y (yod) to the second radical. In the present instance the Aramaic for "little dog" was *kulaibh*. Cf. Gensenius' *Hebrew Grammer*. (Ed. E. Kautzsch [Englished by A. E. Cowley], par. 86 g, note 1.) If, however, the diminutive were not used in Aramaic then the qualifying adjective "little" must have been added by Our Lord. Otherwise there would be no good reason why the translator of St. Matthew should have passed over the ordinary word κύων and selected the diminutive κυνάριον.

[6] St. Mark expressly says that she was Ἑλληνίς i.e. Greek. Although this word is often used as a generic term to indicate all Gentiles (regardless of language) as distinguished from Jews, yet it is also used to refer to Greek speaking Gentiles. In fact, St. Mark's full description of her is that she was "Greek, a Syro-phoenician by race." This would seem to indicate that, although she was racially descended from the Phoenicians, yet by language she was Greek speaking. The Greek language was spoken by many non-Jews in northern Palestine which was in the direct line of the great trade routes frequented by Greek speaking traders, and indeed was inhabited by a considerable number of such foreigners. Strabo (XVI) mentions Egyptians, Arabians, and Phoenicians as inhabiting Galilee. Phoenicia itself was even more hellenized under the domination of the Seleucid Rulers. Cf. *Dictionnaire de la Bible* (Vigouroux) Phenicie, V, 246. These considerations, then, would point to the conclusion that Christ spoke with the woman in Greek.

fore, the expression "little dog" or "puppy" was chosen by Our Lord purposely. What was His purpose? First, to disassociate Himself from the hypocritical and contemptuous manner in which the Scribes and Pharisees referred to all Gentiles as dogs, and thus spare this poor creature, as we would expect Him to do, the humiliating ignominy which she would otherwise have felt. Secondly, He chooses this metaphor as such, in order to teach a great spiritual truth connected with the mystery of God's plan of salvation.

The first and principal reason for Christ's choice of the diminutive term was, as we have said, to disassociate His comparison from the one commonly employed in contempt by the pharisaical Jews. We will understand better how the Pharisees could refer contemptuously to the Gentiles as dogs, and at the same time perceive why Christ in no wise adopted their usage in the present instance, if we keep before our mind the place which the dog occupied in the history of the Jews.

There are many references to the dog in the Old Testament. The majority of them cast the animal in a bad light, reflecting for the most part the unclean and baser characteristics which dogs can have, and did have, it seems, particularly in Palestine. Generally they are pictured in the Bible as wild, unclean, noisy, voracious creatures roaming in groups on the edges of towns or through the streets. Thus they are represented as public scavengers eager for refuse and even dead bodies (*III Kings* 14:11; 16:4; 21:23 f.; *Psalm* 67:24). One's enemies are compared to dogs circling the edges of a town in search of prey (*Psalm* 58:7, 15). In a pack they are enemies dangerous enough to be reckoned with even by man (*Psalm* 21:17). In the Old Testament dogs are singled out from all the animals as most expressive and representative of lewdness and impurity. So male prostitutes (regarded as sacred and employed in the pagan Canaanite sanctuaries) are called "dogs" in *Deuteronomy* 23, 18. Likewise in the New Testament the word "dog" is taken as synonymous with fornication and impurity and general immorality (*Apoc.* 22:15).

This may well be the reason why the Jews began to refer to pagans in general as dogs. For in the Old Testament, pagan idolatry, especially as practiced by the Canaanites in Palestine, was quite synonymous with fornication, not only by reason of sacred

prostitution which was common in the pagan fertility cults, but also because, for Israel, any form of idolatry involved desertion of the only lawful and true spouse, Yahweh, and union with an illegitimate spouse such as was the pagan god. So in keeping with this thought the Sacred writers often refer metaphorically to idolatry as fornication and adultery (*Deut.* 31:16; *Judges* 2:16 f.; 8:33; *Isaias* 1:21; *Ezechiel* 6:9; *Osee* 1:2). What more natural, therefore, than the choice of the promiscuous, impure "dog" as the metaphor best qualified to designate the illegitimate and debased worship of idolatry?[7] If such be the truth of the matter we can understand the fact (which otherwise creates a difficulty) that the Jews, more than any other people in antiquity, seem to have held dogs in contempt. Furthermore, this reasoned explanation of Jewish aversion to dogs in the Old Testament is corroborated if we recall the fact that in Egypt the dog was one of the animals which at times was worshipped by pagans, and at all times held sacred by them.[8] This close association of the dog with pagan religion, imbedded in the Israelitic consciousness by four hundred years of exile contact with Egypt, could only serve subsequently to set the Israelites more easily against the animal.

However, we must not press this point of aversion to dogs too far. There is evidence that the Jews could prescind from these baser characteristics of the dog and recognize its good qualities. They seem to have used them at times as watch dogs for their flocks and for their homes (*Isaias* 56:10; *Job* 30:1). And there is a note of friendship and familiarity in the description which

[7] In so far as the term was descriptive of idolatry or the sins committed in idolatry's name one could not object to its use. In fact it was in a similar sense that Christ Himself used it when He said to His disciples: "Do not give to dogs what is holy" (*Matt.* 7:6). In this case Christ applied the metaphor to both Jews and Gentiles and meant: "Do not continue to give holy things to hardened, coarse sinners who wallow in the filth of of unrepentant sensuality." When pharisaical pride and hypocrisy transferred the term from the sin to the individual sinner with added contempt and abuse, only then would its use be open to objection and therefore excluded from Christ's manner of speech.

[8] Cf. V. Ermoni, *La Religion de l'Egypte Ancienne* (Paris, 1909), p. 108. Cf. also *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* t. 1, n. 86. The Phoenician inscription reproduced there, uses the term "dogs" in a seemingly honorable and praiseworthy sense referring to male prostitutes of the sacred temple.

Tobias gives us of the dog which accompanied his master on a long journey (*Tobias* 6:1; 11:9).[9]

The Talmudic Writings, while evidencing the same underlying antipathy to the dog, also offer instances of benign acceptance of it in and around the home. For example, according to the Talmud, it was licit to breed certain types of dogs; they were kept chained on an owner's property, allowed in the home, and were even fed certain food especially prepared for them.[10] This would seem to indicate that certain kinds of dogs, different from the wild, scavenger breed of the street, were domesticated. At any rate, regardless of type, if they were bred and allowed in the home it would certainly be when they were little, could be easily handled, and could serve as pets for the children of the household.[11]

If this were true even among Jews, we would expect to find a still more ready and prevalent acceptance of the dog among non-Jewish pagans. Indeed, there is no doubt that dogs, especially little ones, were allowed in pagan homes, serving as pets and partaking of the left-over food of the table. It was a familiar and common custom.[12] And Our Divine Lord, on this occasion, was speaking in or near pagan territory to a pagan woman who was very familiar with the custom to which He most certainly referred. He distinctly says that the dogs He has in mind are in the home of their owner, that they are entitled eventually to some part of the common food, that there are children in the home, and that the dogs are little ones such as would serve well as pets for the children. And the Syro-phoenician woman understands the whole figured speech in exactly the same sense. She shows not the slight-

[9] The last-mentioned passages from Tobias describe events which took place in a pagan land, it is true, but the family of Tobias was Jewish and would hardly have changed an attitude so quickly. It must be acknowledged that verse 9 of chapter 11 is not found in the traditional Greek version.

[10] The passages of the Talmud giving the above information are as follows: (Soncino Press Edition) Seder Nezkin, Baba Kamma, p. 455; *ibid.*, p. 471; Seder Zera'in p. 323; Shabbath, Gemara, p. 78.

[11] One writer who lived in Palestine observes that in the Near East of today dogs, when they grow up, are never allowed in the home, but as puppies they are frequently brought into the home and eat the fragments which fall from the table. Rev. E. J. Hardy, *The Unvarying East*, p. 38.

[12] Cf. for example, Homer, *Iliad* XXIII, 173; Xenophon, *History of Cyrus*, LVIII, Cap. 4, 20; Origen, *Commentary on St. Matthew*, *PG* 13, 962.

est sign of being offended or hurt by the comparison. On the contrary, she presses the comparison, and with a persistent faith, delicate as it was clever, she renders the Son of God defenseless before her.

It is true that Christ was making plain to her that the Jews were the chosen race and as such were entitled, in the designs of God's Wisdom, to the first fruits of His own miracles and gifts ahead of the Gentiles. But He distinctly states that the Gentiles are in the household of God's plan of salvation, and that, in the proper time, they will be fed with the food of divine power in signs and miracles. The principal point of Christ's teaching, however, does not lie in the comparison of the children to the little dogs, as if this were the relative worth of Jew and Gentile before God. The whole force of the comparison rests rather in the element of precedence and time. The Jews must be invited, with the grace of signs and miracles, to enter the Messianic Kingdom first. Only then will the Kingdom be preached with power to the Gentiles. And it is just here that this humble mother, like Christ's Mother at Cana, forces Him, with her persevering and unwavering faith, to change, as it were, the order of things. So she argues: granted that the household pets are not to be fed until the children have first eaten, yet, even while the children are at table the pets have now and then a fragment which falls to the floor. So, even though the Gentiles will eat only when the Jews have first been fed, yet, even now while the Jews are at table, a stray fragment of one miracle falling to the lot of one, alert, little pet, a Gentile such as she, will in no wise disrupt the general order of God's plan.

Surely if ever wisdom and simplicity were wedded, it was in this reply of the humble Syro-phoenician woman. And the more we consider the reply, the more wonderful it becomes. Only we must be sure to ponder it in the one, proper and correct setting which gives it the brilliant luster which belongs to it. In résumé the following explanatory paraphrase is the correct setting.

Jesus says: "The children of the household must eat first before their pets, the little dogs, are fed. Even so is it right that my Chosen People, the Jews, be treated first to the message of the Gospel, preached to them with signs and power, and only afterwards the Gentiles." To this the woman replies: "Yea, Lord, what thou sayest is true. But even while the children eat at table,

the pets at their feet catch, now and then, a fragment of food which falls to the floor. Even so, while thou dost reserve thy ministry of preaching and dispensing miracles for thy Chosen People, it will not disrupt the order, or matter much if thou dost allow one such fragment of miraculous power to fall to me, the little one, who kneel, hungry and expectant, at thy feet." And Jesus, overcome by this guileless simplicity and unwavering faith, made the only answer which His compassionate love would permit: "O woman, great is thy faith! Be it done to thee as thou wilt."

ELMER A. MCNAMARA

St. Bernard's Seminary
Rochester, N. Y.

PARADOX

Life comes forth from a seed that died;
Courage is born from out defeat.
Faith grows strong in trials of night;
Moments make a life complete.
Blossoms must die to bear the fruit;
A loss can bring a greater gain.
And joy is found in sorrow's cup;
The price of Life—a Cross of pain.

FRATER NORBERT F. LEHR, O.F.M.

FATHER JOURNET'S CONCEPT OF THE CHURCH

Ever since the end of the sixteenth century, theological writing on the basic concept of the Catholic Church has revolved around the last four paragraphs of the second chapter in St. Robert Bellarmine's *De ecclesia militante*. Most of the authors who have dealt with this particular section of sacred doctrine have tried to explain and to develop the teachings set forth in these paragraphs. Others, rather numerous during the course of the last half century, have challenged these teachings.

The four paragraphs with which we are concerned contain St. Robert's statement and justification of his definition of the true Church of Jesus Christ.

But we teach that there is only one Church, and not two, and that the one and true Church is the assembly *(coetum)* of men bound together by the profession of the same Christian faith and by the communion of the same sacraments, under the rule of legitimate pastors, and especially of the one Vicar of Christ on earth, the Roman Pontiff. From this definition it is easy to infer which men belong to the Church and which ones do not belong to it. This definition has three parts, the profession of the true faith, the communion of the sacraments, and subjection to the Roman Pontiff, the legitimate pastor. By reason of the first part, all infidels, both those who never have been in the Church, such as Jews, Turks, and pagans, and those who have been in it, but have left, such as heretics and apostates, are excluded. By reason of the second part, catechumens and excommunicated persons are excluded, since the former have not as yet been admitted to the communion of the sacraments, while the latter have been expelled from it. By reason of the third, schismatics, who have the faith and the sacraments, but who are not subject to the legitimate pastor, and who consequently profess the faith and receive the sacraments outside [the Church], are excluded. All others are included, even though they be reprobates, hardened sinners, and impious men.

Now there is this difference between our teaching on this point and all the others [the four heretical notions of the Church previously listed in this chapter]. All the others hold that internal virtues are requisite in order that a man may be constituted in the Church, and therefore they consider the true Church as invisible. On the other hand, although we believe that all the virtues, faith, hope, charity, and the rest, are to be found in the Church, we do not think that any internal virtue

at all, but only the outward profession of faith and the sensibly manifest communion of the sacraments are required in order that a man may be judged absolutely to be a part of the true Church of which the Scriptures speak. For the Church is as visible and palpable an assembly of men as the assembly of the Roman people, or the kingdom of France, or the republic of Venice.

We should note that, according to Augustine, in his *Breviculus collationis*, where he is dealing with the conference of the third day, that the Church is a living body in which there is a soul and a body. The internal gifts of the Holy Ghost, faith, hope, charity, and the rest, constitute the soul. The external profession of the faith and the communication of the sacraments are the body. Hence it is that some are of the soul and of the body of the Church, and thus joined to Christ the Head both inwardly and outwardly. Such men are most perfectly of the Church, for they are like living members in a body. Still, even among these, some partake of this life in a greater, and others in a lesser, degree, while some have only the beginning of life and, as it were, sensation without movement, like those who have faith alone, without charity. Again, there are some who are of the soul and not of the body [of the Church], like catechumens or excommunicated persons, if they have faith and charity, as they may very well have. Finally, there are some who are of the body but not of the soul, as those who have no inward virtue, but who still profess the faith and receive the sacraments under the rule of the pastors by reason of some temporal hope or fear. These are like hairs or fingernails or evil liquids in the human body.

Therefore our definition takes in only this last way of being in the Church since this is required as a minimum in order that a man may be said to be a part of the visible Church. Now we must demonstrate in an orderly fashion that the unbaptized, heretics and apostates, excommunicated persons, and schismatics do not belong to the Church, and that those not predestined, the imperfect, sinners, even those whose offenses are manifest, and occult infidels do belong to the Church if they have the sacraments, the profession of faith, the subjection, and the rest.[1]

During the first half of our century there were some notable efforts to challenge St. Robert's teaching "that there is only one Church, and not two." Some rather fashionable writers in the field of sacred theology tried to prove the coexistence of an

[1] *De ecclesia militante*, chapter 2. The translation is my own, as are the various translations of passages from Fr. Journet's book cited in this article.

invisible Church along with the visible one. Others, while not explicitly denying the essential visibility of the true Church, held that the boundaries of this society are quite indistinct and thus, by implication, tried to rob the concept of visibility of much of its meaning. Still others were repelled by the forthrightness of St. Robert's teaching, and tried to show that some sort of true and sincere faith was actually necessary for membership in the true Church.

It is noteworthy that much of the opposition to St. Robert's teaching was discredited by the content of the encyclical *Mystici corporis*. According to this encyclical, "only those who have received the laver of regeneration and who profess the true faith, and who have neither unhappily separated themselves from the fabric of the Body or been cast out by legitimate authority by reason of most serious offenses are to be numbered as members of the Church."[2] Thus it presented the teaching of St. Robert as the doctrine of the Catholic Church, set forth officially by Christ's Vicar on earth.

Last year, however, there appeared in France what seems to be one of the most radical challenges to St. Robert's teaching in all modern theological literature. Fr. Charles Journet, professor in the major seminary at Fribourg in Switzerland, last year published one section of his extensive and erudite treatise *L'Église du Verbe Incarné*.[3] In this book the author takes issue with the basic procedures and the main contentions of the second chapter in St. Robert's *De ecclesia militante*. Fr. Journet objects to St. Robert's action in defining the true Church without including a mention of faith or charity in the definition. He also finds the Saint's statement that "the Church is as visible and palpable an assembly of men as the assembly of the Roman people, or the

[2] *AAS*, XXV, (1943), 202.

[3] *L'Église du Verbe Incarné, Essai de théologie spéculative.* II *Sa structure interne et son unité catholique*, by Charles Journet. The book is published by Desclée, De Brouwer et Cie. of Paris and is a part of the *Bibliotheque de la Revue Thomiste*. The first part is already written, according to the author, but at the time of this writing it has not yet been published. The projected third and fourth sections have not as yet been completed. The volume with which we are concerned runs to xlviii + 1393 pages.

kingdom of France, or the republic of Venice" quite unacceptable. Here is what Fr. Journet has to say on this subject.

> St. Bellarmine seeks to define the Church without mentioning either charity or the supernatural virtue of faith. In the heat of the controversy, preoccupied with the task of opposing the Catholic truth of the visible Church to the Protestant error of the invisible Church, he forces himself to put in parentheses as much as possible whatever belongs to the realm of the mysteries within the Church: grace, the infused virtues, and the three Divine Persons, to leave only a husk. [He goes] to the point of forgetting momentarily what, being a Saint, he knew better than anyone else, the fact that, if the Church is visible, it is not so in the manner of a natural society or of the republic of Venice, it is [visible] as what it is, a supernatural society and the very Body of Christ.[4]

After giving a French translation of most of the section of St. Robert's book which this article carries in an English version, Fr. Journet makes this observation.

> One may say that, in this unfortunate chapter *De definitione ecclesiae*, Bellarmine himself realizes that he is making a bad job of it *(se rend compte qu'il s'est mal engagé)*. After all, that which he had defined at the very beginning as the only true Church, that is, the community in which the faith is professed in an exterior manner, the sacraments are received in an exterior manner, the government obeyed in an exterior manner; this is the very reality which he now says represents truly only the body of the Church. The interior gifts of the Holy Ghost, faith, hope, and charity, constitute the *soul* of the Church. Thus the soul and the body of the Church would be separable, in such a way that a man could be of the body of the Church without being of its soul, of its soul without belonging to the body, etc.[5]

In line with these views, Fr. Journet denies one of the central contentions in St. Robert's *De ecclesia militante*. Fr. Journet believes that "neither complete hypocrites nor occult heretics belong to the Church."[6]

The author of *L'Église du Verbe Incarné* has given evidence of extraordinary erudition in his book. Unfortunately, however, he has not shown himself a particularly discerning student of St. Robert Bellarmine. He seems completely to misunderstand the

[4] Journet, *op. cit.*, p. 1181.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 1192. Cf. pp. 53 ff.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 1183.

type of definition St. Robert worked to elaborate in the second chapter of his *De ecclesia militante*. He certainly misjudges the use St. Robert made of the terms "soul" and "body," when he applied them to the Church in this particular chapter. And he certainly does the magnificent Doctor of the Church a serious injustice when he suggests that, in the heat of controversy, important truths about the Church of Jesus Christ were misstated or forgotten in the composition of the *De ecclesia militante*.

In the first place, any close examination of the text itself will show very clearly that St. Robert never intended to formulate any essential definition of the only true Church of Jesus Christ in the second chapter of his *De ecclesia militante*. Throughout the entire chapter, and, for that matter throughout the eight subsequent chapters, St. Robert is concerned only with conditions requisite for membership in the one true Church. His definition of the Church is a description of this society in terms of the minimum requirements for membership in it. It was never intended to be anything else.

St. Robert Bellarmine was engaged in controversy against opponents who agreed with him about the basic concept of the one true Church of Jesus Christ. All of the participants in this dispute were in perfect accord about the existence of a community or group of men within which alone salvific contact with Our Lord was to be found. The point at issue was the identity of this community. The Protestant writers had renewed, with some modifications of their own, the old heretical teaching that this community was not an organized society, and specifically that it was not the organized society over which the Bishop of Rome presides as the visible head. The Catholic writers were firm in their insistence that the true Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, the one kingdom of God on this earth, was that very organization. When these men declared that the true Church is visible, they meant that the kingdom of God on earth, the only assembly within which men have salvific contact with Christ, is a society, including in its membership both good and evil men, both the reprobate and the predestined. When, on the other hand, the Protestant writers defended the concept of an invisible Church, they meant that the assembly of the Saints was not an organized

social group at all, and that salvific contact with Our Lord could be achieved independently of any organization.

The Catholic truth, in other words, is the teaching that the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ on this earth is an organized society, and hence a community in which men possess membership by reason of certain definitely recognizable or visible factors. St. Robert, and Becanus after him,[7] were perfectly justified in appealing to the parallel of the political groups extant in their own times. By the favor of divine providence, the true and only Church of Jesus Christ on earth is as visible and manifest an organization as the republic of Venice or the kingdom of France ever were. St. Robert did not "forget" anything when he insisted upon this truth.

Furthermore, he was perfectly faithful to Our Lord's own teaching about His Church when he left charity and the supernatural virtue of faith out of the formula which he meant to express the minimum requisites for membership in that Church. One of the main themes in Our Lord's parables of the kingdom is the warning that on the last day the Church will be purified by the permanent expulsion of those members who have passed from this world without the supernatural virtues. The obvious implication of this warning is that here on earth men who are devoid at least of charity can retain their membership in His Mystical Body.

One of the central errors about the constitution of Our Lord's Church has always taken the form of a certain ecclesiastical Docetism. Just as the Docetists long ago were unwilling to admit that a real man, who really suffered and was really repudiated and crucified, could actually be the Son of God, so, in more recent times, there have always been individuals who were repelled by the thought that this organization, with its bad members intermingled with the good, is really the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ. They have been too delicate to accept the fact that God wills us to find our salvific contact with Our Lord in an organization, any one of whose members or even superiors may not be living the life of divine grace at all. It was precisely against this tendency that St. Robert wrote his book, *De ecclesia militante*. Unfortu-

[7] Becanus copies St. Robert's expression in his *Manuale controversiarum huius temporis* (Würzburg, 1623), p. 38.

nately, it is this tendency which would designate his chapter on the definition of the Church as "cet infortuné chapitre."

When Fr. Journet objects against St. Robert's omission of the factors which, for him, constituted the "soul" of the Church from his definition in terms of membership, he betrays a serious misconception of St. Robert's procedure and habitual terminology. Fr. Journet, as a matter of fact, builds his central concept of the Church around the notions of "soul" and "body." He distinguishes sedulously between the uncreated Soul of the Church and its created soul. For him, as we shall see, the "souls" and the "body" go together to form the Church itself.

St. Robert, on the other hand, employed the terms in quite a different way. The first statement in the all-important paragraph in which he first employs this distinction in the *De ecclesia militante* is the declaration that "the Church is a living body, in which there is a soul and a body."[8] St. Robert attributed this teaching to St. Augustine, and Fr. Journet, incidentally, tells us that he has gone through the *Breviculus collationis,* the work of St. Augustine mentioned in this reference, without finding the text in question.[9]

Actually there is no passage which contains this explicit statement in the entire *Breviculus collationis* at all. Later in the *De ecclesia militante,* in the ninth chapter to be exact, St. Robert indicates the text to which he had reference. It is the paragraph in which St. Augustine speaks of the *homo interior* and the *homo exterior,* using an expression employed by St. Paul himself.[10] In this ninth chapter, St. Robert speaks of good Catholics as *quasi anima ecclesiae* and of bad ones as *quasi corpus.*[11]

[8] St. Robert, *loc. cit.*

[9] Cf. Journet, p. 566, n.

[10] The passage in the *Breviculus collationis* reads: "Dictum est etiam de homine exteriore et interiore, quae cum sint diversa, non tamen dici duos homines: quanto minus dici duas Ecclesias, cum iidem ipsi qui nunc boni tolerant permixtos malos et resurrecturi moriuntur, tunc nec mixtos malos habituri sint, nec omnino morituri." The expression "interiorem hominem" occurs in *Rom.* 7:22; and in *Eph.* 3:16. The term "homo exterior" is not found in the Vulgate.

[11] St. Robert's text here reads as follows. "Certe in breviculo collationum, collatione tertia, cum Donatistae calumniarentur Catholicos duas Ecclesias facere; unam quae solos bonos, aliam quae bonos cum malis contineret:

It is perfectly obvious, then, that St. Robert never took the terms "body" and "soul" of the Church as seriously as does Fr. Journet. In the same volume, the Saint designates the Church itself, the factors which earlier Catholic controversialists had called the outward or bodily bond of union within the Church, and bad Catholics, as a "body." He uses the term "soul" to indicate both the inward bond of union within the Church and good Catholics themselves. He obviously never intended to have the terms employed strictly, according to all exigencies of the hylemorphic theory. In his mind, the Church was certainly not an entity made up of this "body" animated and actuated by what he designated in his famous second chapter as the "soul."

Actually Fr. Journet's use of the terms "body" and "soul" with reference to the Catholic Church is such as to imply that the Church is not really a *coetus hominum,* an assembly or group of men at all. "It is easy," he tells us, "to define the body of the Church from the point of view of the Church's efficient, formal, or final cause. We shall say that it is the visible and outward bearing of men *(le comportement visible et extérieur des hommes)* —that is, their visible being, their visible activity, their visible working."[12] This is the reality which is moved by the motion of the Holy Ghost and of Our Lord Himself, informed by the outpouring of His capital grace, and raised to the very final cause of the economy of grace.

It is important to note that it is not the men themselves, but their conduct or activity which is said to be the "body" of the Catholic Church, the element which, together with the "soul" and vivified by that "soul," makes up the Church itself. Fr. Journet's further elucidations show that he takes this concept very seriously. He tells us "that there are sinners in the Church but that they do not bring their sin into it. The Church is not without sinners, but it is without sin, 'glorious, not having spot or wrinkle or any

---

responderunt Catholici se nunquam duas Ecclesias somniasse, sed tantum distinguere partes vel tempora Ecclesiae; partes quidem quia aliter boni, aliter mali, ad Ecclesiam pertinent, boni enim sunt pars interior et quasi anima Ecclesiae, mali sunt pars exterior et quasi corpus, et dabant exemplum de homine interiore et exteriore, qui non sunt duo homines sed duae partes eiusdem hominis."

[12] Journet, *op. cit.,* p. 879.

such thing, but holy and without blemish.'[13] Its boundaries run across our heart to divide the light there from the darkness."[14]

The language used by Fr. Journet in this connection is figurative in the extreme. In itself, and in its context, it is incompatible with the notion that the Church is properly and definitely a *coetus hominum*. And, if the ideas underlying this language be completely acceptable, then it would seem to follow that the old definition of the Church as the *congregatio* or *convocatio fidelium* could never have been more than approximately accurate. A congregation or society is a reunion of men and not simply a summation of their conduct.

Moreover, in his book, Fr. Journet tends to represent the Church more as an institution towards which good men tend automatically than as a society with a genuine and really urgent universal missionary commission. He seems to depict it primarily as a center towards which the supernatural life of grace in the world is meant to converge more or less of its own accord.

> In the order of salvation, gathered close to Christ who favors it with His contact, it is the point of condensation of an immense cloudiness, the solid center which, moreover, attracts, sustains and draws into its wake more or less closely millions of men scattered like atoms throughout space and time.[15]

The missionary commission of the Catholic Church is certainly understressed in this concept, and in the one brought out in the following paragraph, which forms the conclusion to Fr. Journet's treatise on the necessity of the Church.

> So the Church, the Church of Christ entrusted to Peter, is at the same time more pure and more extensive than we realize. It is more pure because it is without sin, though not without sinners, and the faults of its members never deface it. It is more extensive, because it gathers about itself everything that is saved in the world. It knows that, from the depths of space and of time, there are attached to it by desire, in an initial and hidden way, millions of men who are prevented by invincible ignorance from knowing it, but who have not refused, in the midst of the errors in which they live, the grace of living faith which, in the secret of their hearts, God who wills that

[13] Cf. *Eph.*, 5:27.
[14] Journet, *op. cit.*, p. 1103.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 1102.

all men should be saved and should come to the knowledge of the truth offers to them. [The Church] itself does not know them by name, but it feels their innumerable presence around itself and sometimes, amidst the silences of prayer, it hears in the night the confused sound of their walking.[16]

This concept of the Church, surrounded and, as it were cushioned, in this world by millions of its unknown and unknowing adherents may seem to be reassuring, but actually it has nothing like any adequate backing in the content of God's revelation about His Church. It is a dogma of the Catholic faith that the true Church is necessary for salvation. It is likewise perfectly certain, an article of Catholic doctrine, that a man may be attached to the Church in such a way as to be saved, and to obtain membership in the Church triumphant, without ever having been a member of the Church militant here on earth. Such has been the case with those whom the Church honors and venerates as martyrs because they gave their lives for the faith before they had the opportunity to receive the sacrament of baptism, without which membership in the Church militant of the New Testament is impossible. Such is the case with catechumens who die before they can be baptized, as the familiar teaching of St. Ambrose assures us.[17]

Furthermore, it is certain likewise that a man may have true and vital faith even if he does not have explicit knowledge of the Catholic Church. The theologians who have worked on the truths which a man must believe explicitly as an absolute minimum if he is to be saved have never included the teaching about the Church itself as one of these truths. Hence we must hold that a man can be saved, and thus be attached to the Church militant in this world by desire, without having an explicit knowledge of this Church. There is such a thing as an effective implicit desire of the Church.

But it is one thing to assert this Catholic doctrine, and quite another to teach that the purity and the extension of the Church are increased by the attachment to the Church of millions who are unknown to the Church and unconscious of their attachment. The Catholic Church is not any larger by reason of people who want to enter it, even when their desire is quite explicit. A man who

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 1114.

[17] Cf. *De obitu Valentiniani.*

is attached to the Church in desire is precisely one who is not a member of it. And it is at best confusing to insist that a visible and visibly holy society is rendered more holy by reason of the virtues of men whom it does not recognize as members and who do not themselves acknowledge the society.

There is a tremendous amount of very fine teaching in *L'Église du Verbe Incarné*. Especially to be commended is the author's success in joining up the concept of Our Lord's capital grace with the notion of the Church itself. Nevertheless, despite its numerous excellent sections and its qualities of erudition, there is a definite danger that the volume may engender more confusion than light among its readers, particularly the younger ones.

The book is a systematization of and an advance in one line of ecclesiological teaching. Unfortunately this line is not the one laid down by St. Robert Bellarmine, the greatest of the Doctors of the Church in the field of ecclesiology. It is the one taken by writers like Adam and Karrer, and, in later days, Congar. It is honest in its declared opposition to the central tenets of St. Robert in his *De ecclesia militante*. At the same time, however, it adduces no evidence whatsoever which should influence students and teachers of sacred theology to forsake the doctrine of St. Robert on the visibility of the Catholic Church.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

BAPTISMAL DIFFICULTIES

Question: a) Please direct the correct procedure in private Baptism. At our hospital, we often have the opportunity of baptizing infants privately. We use only the form of the Sacrament of Baptism. What of the use of Holy Chrism, the giving of the linen cloth, and the presenting of a lighted candle?

b) May a seminarian in our parish act as sponsor when his nephew is baptized?

c) Is one sponsor sufficient? If so, may the sponsor be of the opposite sex of the one being baptized?

Answer: a) In case of urgent necessity or danger of death, the essential ceremony of pouring the water and at the same time reciting the required formula is all that is done. All the usual prayers and ceremonies in this particular situation are omitted.

If our inquirer is referring to private baptism as taking place in a hospital, not under unusual circumstances because of danger of death, then the sacrament is administered with all ceremonies and the full ritual.

b) There are no regulations set forth by the code of canon law forbidding one in minor orders to act as a sponsor at baptism. It is well, however, to inform one's self about specific diocesan regulations.

For one in major orders express permission of his own Ordinary but not the Ordinary of the place is necessary to act as a sponsor when the sacrament of baptism is being conferred.

c) The Code states specifically that one and only one sponsor is required for the sacrament of baptism. Likewise, the sponsor need not be of the same sex as the person he stands for.

BETROTHAL CEREMONY

Question: Recently, a couple approached me about the betrothal ceremony. I was at a loss to know what to answer, not being familiar with such a ceremony.

Answer: Father Weller's edition of the Roman Ritual gives this ceremony at length. He prefaces the ceremony with some remarks, part of which we quote for our inquirer. "There is no prescribed ritual for betrothal. However, it is most fitting that the ceremony take place before the altar of God, and that it be followed by the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, together with the reception of Holy Communion." The prayers and ceremonies that he lists are merely suggestions.

BELL AT BENEDICTION

Question: It seems that every time I attend Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament the server rings the bell differently. What is the regulation on the number of times the bell should be rung?

Answer: The rubrics do not prescribe the ringing of the bell at Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. The Baltimore Ceremonial states that a few strokes of the hand-bell may give notice of Benediction being given. Fortescue informs us that the bell may be rung and where such custom prevails, it is usual to ring the bell three times. In this case, the server rings the bell as the celebrant turns to the people, again in the middle of the blessing and finally as he turns back to the altar.

ANNIVERSARY REQUIEM

Question: During our priests' retreat each year, a Requiem High Mass is sung for the deceased priests. Each year the problem arises just what Mass is to be sung.

Answer: For this particular occasion the anniversary Mass should be sung. Once each year, on a day other than the actual or true anniversary of the death or burial, a Requiem High Mass may be sung if there is sufficient reason or foundation for this purpose. It seems that the annual gathering of the priests in retreat

is the ideal time for the anniversary Mass for their deceased confreres. If not then, when could this principle apply?

SENIORITY TO BE OBSERVED AT COMMUNION TIME

Question: Is there any set procedure to follow in distributing Holy Communion? What I have in mind is the seniority to be followed.

Answer: The priest who distributes Holy Communion should begin on the epistle side. Priests, if there are any, receive Holy Communion first, then, deacons, subdeacons, those in minor orders, the altar boys, then the faithful. Out of courtesy, the laity usually allow the nuns to precede them (Cf. Mueller-Ellis, *Handbook of Ceremonies*).

FLAG IN SANCTUARY

Question: Where is the correct position for the American flag in church?

Answer: If the American flag is displayed in the sanctuary of the church it should be on the gospel side regardless whether it is fastened to the wall or standing upright in some sort of a holder. If the flag is displayed outside of the sanctuary in the body of the church, it is put on the epistle side.

TABERNACLE KEY

Question: As pastor what is my obligation as regards the safe keeping of the tabernacle key? May I keep it in church at all times?

Answer: The Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments on May 26, 1938, issued very definite instructions about the custody of the tabernacle key. The rector or pastor of the church has the primary obligation as regards the safe keeping of this key. He may keep it on his person at all times, keep it in a safe place in the rectory, or keep it locked in a safe or some secret place provided in the sacristy. In the event that he does keep it locked in a secret and safe

place in the sacristy, he has the strict obligation of guarding any second key.

RECONSECRATION OF CHALICE

Question: My chalice has broken where the base and cup meet. I have taken it to an authorized silversmith to be repaired. He tells me that it need not be gilded. Now I am wondering if it is necessary to have it consecrated again.

Answer: The fact that a chalice needs to be regilded does not make it unconsecrated. The law formerly required chalices to be reconsecrated after regilding. The chalice in question, however, must be reconsecrated because the break and separation of the cup from the base make it unfit for sacred use. When a chalice has become unsuited for Holy Mass it loses its consecration.

DRESS FOR MIXED MARRIAGE

Question: What is the proper dress for a priest when he officiates at a mixed marriage? Does it make any difference if the marriage takes place in the rectory, sanctuary or church proper?

Answer: Each priest must follow diocesan regulations in this matter. Where mixed marriages are permitted in church, the Ordinary of the diocese has in most instances specified the proper dress of the officiating clergyman. When the marriage takes place in the sacristy or in the rectory, the priest usually wears the cassock or civilian dress. The authorities direct that in mixed marriages taking place in the rectory, no sacred vestments are worn. By sacred vestments, in this particular case, we mean a surplice, stole and cope.

MASS STIPEND, AD INTENTIONEM DANTIS

Question: If a priest receives a Mass intention, not for a deceased person, but ad intentionem dantis, is he allowed to say this Mass in black vestments when there is a simplex or semi-double office? Or can the Mass be said pro animabus purgatorii with the intention that the benefit of the Mass be applied to the intention of the donor?

Answer: A priest may say the Requiem Mass and in so doing he would fulfill his obligation, provided the donor does not expressly ask for a Mass of the living. The Celebrant, not knowing whether the intention is for the living or the dead, fulfills his obligation by the application of any Mass, whatever its quality.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

THE RIGHT TO ADMINISTER HOLY COMMUNION

Question: A professed clerical student belonging to a religious community is sick in a hospital. May his religious superior bring him Holy Communion, or does this function belong by right to the chaplain of the hospital?

Answer: When it is a case of Holy Communion of devotion, any priest may privately bring the Blessed Sacrament to a sick person (Can. 849, § 1); hence, in the circumstances described by the questioner the religious superior may bring Holy Communion privately to the cleric without asking permission from the chaplain. Of course, the hospital chaplain may give the young man Holy Communion if the latter requests, and this is undoubtedly the usual mode of procedure in the case we are considering. Furthermore, the religious superior may not procure the Blessed Sacrament from the tabernacle of the hospital chapel without at least the presumed permission of the chaplain (Can. 849, § 1). If Holy Communion is to be given to the cleric as Viaticum, it is the right and the duty of the clerical superior to administer the sacrament or to depute another priest to perform this function (Can. 514, § 1).

HONESTY IN SPORTS

Question: Could not something be done by Catholics to promote a spirit of honesty in competitive athletic sports, which seems to be on the decline in schools and colleges? It would seem that the idea that the game is to be won by any and every means is being encouraged even by athletic coaches. For example, a basketball player will deliberately foul an opponent when he is about to score

a basket (by pulling the latter's jersey) in the hope that he will not be seen by the referee and penalized. Sometimes there is even a planned attempt to inflict physical injury on the players of the opposing team, especially in football. I hope that this spirit is not prevalent to any great degree in Catholic schools and colleges; yet I fear that sufficient instruction on this matter and admonition against dishonesty in sports are not provided in Catholic institutions.

Answer: With the questioner I wholeheartedly hold that all forms of dishonesty in sports should be denounced and that adequate instruction on this matter should be a part of the course in religion or ethics given in Catholic schools and colleges. Our young folks should be taught that the moral law regulates competitive athletics, as it does every phase of human activity. However, the chief difficulty in giving definite instruction on the subject is this: What exactly constitutes dishonesty in sports? What norm should be followed in determining what is unfair as distinct from lawful strategy? This is a question which has not been discussed to any great extent by Catholic moralists, and I would hesitate to give any more than general norms.

In the first place, I believe that certain practices in sport are recognized as lawful, even though they involve some deception, and hence may be used without any violation of honesty. Thus, it is a common trick in baseball for the baseman to conceal the fact that he holds the ball in his glove, in order to trap the runner to step off the base; and I do not believe that even the most conscientious player would regard this as dishonest. And certainly, in football the attempt to deceive the opposing side as to the contemplated play by clever passing is a recognized feature of the game.

On the other hand, any practices intended directly to inflict injury on an opponent should be regarded as forbidden. Under this would come the "spiking" of a player in baseball, the tripping of an opponent in hockey, and especially tackling in football in a manner expressly designed to injure an adversary and force him to retire from the game. I believe that the practice of some baseball pitchers of delivering a "bean ball" is also to be condemned. In Catholic schools and colleges such tactics should be vehemently

condemned, and coaches and athletic directors should treat severely any students found guilty of them. They should be denounced, not only as exhibitions of poor sportsmanship but also as transgressions of the moral law.

There are some tricks, too, which are clearly violations of honesty, even though they cause no physical injury to the opponents. Evidently the golfer who kicks his ball out of an unfavorable spot when the others are not looking is guilty of such a violation. But undoubtedly there are many practices in the field of sports, the morality of which might be controverted. Especially there are some, the prohibition of which might be regarded as a merely penal law. That is, they may be such that there is no moral wrong in attempting them, as long as one is willing to stand the penalty if he is detected by the referee or umpire. Perhaps in this category could be included the practice mentioned by the questioner—pulling an opponent's jersey in basketball, to prevent him from making a basket. If a player uses this type of strategy, is he guilty of an act of dishonesty, or can he argue that it is the function of the referee to detect and to penalize such tactics, so that it is a lawful feature of the game to block an opponent in this manner, running the risk of incurring a penalty? I would not venture to answer this and similar problems that might arise in the different forms of sport, since a reasonable judgment on this matter could be passed only by one who is fully familiar with the game in question and with the attitude of those who regularly play the game toward tricks of this nature. I think it would be advisable for players, referees, coaches and athletic directors to give us their views on the honesty or dishonesty of various practices in sports.

At any rate, all who possess any influence or authority over school and college athletes should try to impress them with the need of honesty and fair play in games, not only as something which is decent and upright, but also as an obligation of justice and Christian charity. Even from my limited knowledge of recent sport activities, I am inclined to suspect that the principle that "the end justifies the means" has made considerable inroads on our American tradition of fairness in athletic contests. Catholic boys and girls particularly should be made aware of their duty to be outstanding exemplars of clean and honest sportsmanship.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Book Reviews

ONE SHEPHERD: THE PROBLEM OF CHRISTIAN REUNION. By Charles Boyer, S.J. Translated by Angeline Bouchard. Foreword by John LaFarge, S.J. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1952. Pp. xvi+142. $2.00.

The question of the reunion of Christendom forms a major issue in the crisis which confronts the world today. Most people of religious leanings are becoming increasingly aware of that fact. A current of discontent with sectarianism is moving through contemporary Protestantism and is exerting a powerful influence. This is the Ecumenical Movement which envisions religious unity on a world-wide scale. At the present moment the precise terminus of the movement is unspecified and vague by reason of the divergent views and interests of the parties involved. But the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office has commended their good will and has urged all Catholics to lend them aid with their prayers. Of course, there can be but one concrete terminus assigned to this movement by Divine Providence and that is return to communion with the Holy See.

Father Charles Boyer, S.J., Prefect of Studies and Dean of the Theological Faculty of the Gregorian University in Rome, has issued a small brochure on the subject of Christian reunion: *One Shepherd.* In his capacity as President of the *Unitas Association* and as Editor of its international quarterly review, *Unitas* (published in English, French and Italian), he is in constant contact with the sources of information on contemporary unity movements. In addition to this, he is a theologian of international repute.

One Shepherd aims to give within brief compass a general picture of the problem of Christian reunion. From the very start, he leaves us in no doubt of the context in which he studies the question: "As Catholics see it, the problem of Christian unity, to which they are giving ever-increasing attention, can only be the problem of the return of other Christians to Catholic unity" (pp. xv f.). He begins with the present situation as regards the separated Eastern bodies and Protestantism with their respective historical backgrounds and includes a short study of the Ecumenical Movement. Then, he examines the prospects of reconciliation and finds hope in the general desire for unity and the many changes of ideas and attitudes on the part of non-

Catholics; the overtures of the Holy See in official documents have thrown much light on the subject and the charity of their expression should bear much fruit. Under the heading, "Attempts at Reconciliation" he devotes some pages to the Oxford Movement and the Conversations at Malines. Difficulties in the way are next studied with reference to Eastern dissidents, Protestants and Anglicans together with the question of corporate reunion versus individual conversions. Finally, the author urges prayer, especially the Chair of Unity Octave, and good example offered by a full Catholic life. He also addresses pleas to the separated Eastern dissidents, Anglicans and Protestants, asking them to be faithful to the lights given them until, at length, they return to the fold of Peter.

In the debate of individual conversions versus corporate reunion, Father Boyer does seem to be impressed favorably with the attractive prospect of corporate reunion of a given body with the Catholic Church. But he is quite careful to observe: "When a person is convinced that the Roman Catholic Church is the only true Church of Christ, can this person be dispensed from asking admission into the Church on the grounds that by staying out he might hasten the return of an entire community or denomination, or even of an entire Church? The answer is no" (p. 110). Actually, though, this very sound principle is fatal to the notion of formal corporate reunion of any Protestant body with the Holy See. Apart from small group reunions of like-minded individuals or even extensive numbers of individual conversions (corporate in a material sense only), it would seem that the pursuit of the formally corporate ideal is illusory. Charity and truth would be best served by making that fact very clear. A denomination which is constituted by the private judgment of the individuals which compose it or which is a State establishment with a comprehensive position in doctrinal matters does not constitute a *whole* in the same sense that a purely schismatic body does, but only a *mass*. As such, it is nothing more than a collection of individuals and reunion will require the conversion of each member to the faith; should such a conversion be achieved in a given case, there is no good reason for waiting for anyone else: the general return will be best promoted by the example of his own entrance into the Church. *Per accidens* it might seem favorable to the general return for such an individual to remain a Protestant and gather recruits envisioning the return of the whole body to the Church, but *per se* he negates by his own conduct the effects of his words and it is not a good moral principle for one to preach to others less enlightened while oneself may become a castaway: having sufficient light to act yet failing to do so. (Of course, we must allow for the possibility of an invincibly erroneous conscience in the matter.) Father Boyer is in complete

accord with this observation: ". . . we do not obey Christ when we remain outside the Church that we know He has founded" (p. 111).

In his brief discussion on the subject of Anglican Orders, Father Boyer holds that the *Apostolicae curae* of Pope Leo XIII has all the conditions required for an infallible document, but points out that some have held a contrary opinion. It is very difficult to see how the contrary position can be maintained. Leo XIII himself, within two months of the publication of that document, wrote to the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris *(Religioni apud Anglos)* stating: ". . . *sententiam Nostram nemo prudens recteque animatus compellere in dubitationem posset, catholici autem omnes summo deberent obsequio amplecti, tamquam perpetuo firmam, ratam, irrevocabilem. . . .*"

This little work keeps closely within the spirit of the instructions of the Holy See; it manifests a real charity towards all dissidents as well as a firm devotion to truth. Of course, one would not expect to find an exhaustive treatment of any one of the subjects considered. But what is treated would well serve as an introduction to the general picture of the problem of Christian reunion. We hope that the reception accorded this book will induce the author to produce a larger and more complete treatment along similar lines. We would recommend the inclusion of a treatment on the necessity of the Church for salvation, as Pope Pius XII does in his appeal to non-Catholics in his *Mystici corporis.* In future editions of this work, it is more desirable to use the expression, "Chair of Unity Octave" than "Church Unity Octave" or "Octave *pro unione.*"

May this book serve to increase the interest and understanding of our people in the great work for Christian unity and direct the minds of non-Catholics along correct lines should they desire to know our position. May it also spread the observance of the Chair of Unity Octave!

EDWARD F. HANAHOE, S.A.

THE SACRED CANONS. By John A. Abbo and Jerome D. Hannan. St. Louis: The B. Herder Book Company, 1952. Vol. I, Pp. xxii+871. Vol. II, Pp. 936. $19.00.

In the span of a few short years, the church of the United States has made a remarkable contribution to the science of ecclesiastical law. The school of Canon Law at Catholic University has taken its place alongside Bologna and Paris of the past, the Apollinare and the Gregorianum of the present. Each of its more than a hundred theses has been a distinct advance in the science of law. The graduates have

carried with them everywhere not only a deep knowledge of canon law, but a love for it and a zeal for its application. Through its quarterly review, *The Jurist,* research and collaboration have found a prolific culture.

Out of this enthusiasm for the law has come a nationwide society of canonists, the Canon Law Society of America. The meetings of this young organization on both the national and regional level have been marked with both vitality and scholarship.

Nor has this progress been purely speculative. The diocesan and metropolitan courts have been reorganized *ad tramitem iuris.* Our religious communities have revamped their constitutions to bring them into conformity with the Code. Certainly, we have been witnessing here in the States a renaissance of sacred law.

Only against this background can we appreciate America's most recent contribution to ecclesiastical law, a commentary entitled, *The Sacred Canons.* Within the some eighteen hundred pages of two volumes we find the rich, mature fruit of American scholarship, research, collaboration and experience.

This commentary comes to us under the names of two men, long distinguished in the field of canonical studies, Msgr. John A. Abbo and Msgr. Jerome D. Hannan. Monsignor Abbo is presently Professor of Church and State Relations at Seton Hall University. Formerly he held the chair of Moral Theology and Canon Law at Conception Abbey, Conception, Missouri. Msgr. Hannan's legal mind first manifested itself in his monumental work, *The Canon Law of Wills.* Both as a teacher of Canon Law at Catholic University and editor of *The Jurist,* he has acquired considerable prestige, authority and affection among American jurists.

The Sacred Canons is at once a theoretical exposition and a practical manual of canon law. It is written completely in English and as such is intended to reach not only the student, the busy parish priest, the religious clergy but also lay religious, lay jurists and the laity in general. Since the Latin of the Code can be read along with the commentary, they have wisely omitted the canons.

The finest recommendation that this or any canon law manual could have is a preface by His Excellency, the Most Rev. Amleto G. Cicognani, D.D., Apostolic Delegate. His benign influence and guidance in matters canonical have been felt all through his many years in America. His composing the preface for *The Sacred Canons* is just another gracious gesture in this direction. As a former professor of Canon Law at the Apollinare and author of an unsurpassed work on the fundamentals of canon law, His Excellency's endorsement is the finest guarantee available of the exceptional merits of this commentary.

The Sacred Canons has many features to recommend it and to make it a welcome and even indispensable companion to the growing library of American canonical studies. It incorporates the many and varied responses and interpretations that have proceeded from the Holy See since the promulgation of the Code. This commentary further places adequate emphasis upon the legislation of the Councils of Baltimore since many phases still retain their force. Plenary councils visualize the particular conditions of an individual country and consequently their decrees are an excellent commentary and a practical supplement to the canons of the Code. The chapter on clerical obligations (Vol. I, pp. 179-207) will be an eye-opener to many.

The index found at the end of the second volume covers about every conceivable subject in ecclesiastical legislature and the flyleaf tells us that we should be able by means of this index of 4,500 entries to localize any item in sixty seconds. My experience is that there is here a slight discrepancy in the time element between "de jure" and "de facto" but that may be the individual.

It is quite evident that the publication of this work by the Herder Book Company has been an extremely costly undertaking. Each of the two volumes runs close to nine hundred pages. The type is large and clear with italics and bold type used in such a way as to make a very inviting page. On the whole this work gives the impression of a finely conceived, well-planned and patiently prepared commentary. The price of nineteen dollars for the two volumes may seem somewhat expensive at first sight but we must remember that these are law books, manuals, reference books that will endure indefinitely and furthermore as a French lady once remarked to us as students, "We are too poor to buy cheap things." *The Sacred Canons* is standard equipment for priests, seminarians and lay religious.

TIMOTHY J. CHAMPOUX

THE VIRGIN MARY. By Jean Guitton. Translated by A. Gordon Smith. New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1952. Pp. x + 190. $2.75.

The theologian, according to M. Guitton, "should first seek the equivalent of the old eternal errors, and then find terms in which the Church of his own day, without any reference to antecedent history, might express what it has to say in contemporary language" (p. 126). The present book represents a very serious effort on his part to do exactly that in the field of Mariology. He has tried, with some success, to explain what the Catholic faith and Catholic theology have to say about Our Lady, and to present that explanation in terms familiar to the modern intellectual.

After an introductory chapter on "Faith and Devotion," the body of the present book is divided into four parts. The first deals with "The Virgin of History." The second is entitled "The Development of Thought Concerning the Virgin," and the third, "The Mystery of Mary." The fourth part treats of "The Blessed Virgin and the Present Age."

In every one of these sections the advantages and the disadvantages of M. Guitton's procedure make themselves felt. The main advantage lies in an intensely interesting statement of problems. The most obvious disadvantage, in this case, is to be found in a confused and sometimes even clumsy statement of solutions.

The chapter about "Faith and Devotion" is not particularly successful from the point of view of clarity and accuracy. M. Guitton tells us that, "when the believer reasons on the lines of sound theology, he draws a radical distinction between the province of faith which contains the truths essential to salvation, and the vaguer region of popular devotion, fortuitous, optional and coloured by usage" (pp. 2 f.). Then he informs us that "obvious and visible manifestations of devotion" are "all too well adapted to the methods of psychiatry, not to mention those of sociology and statistics." He asks, "Who can tell if the sale of rosaries proves the progress of belief in God, or the progress of superstition?" And he complains that "It is perplexing to the modern mind to be confronted with these lower forms of religious awareness. It finds it difficult to understand how that which is most *pure* can have as a condition of its existence something in itself *not pure*" (p. 3). And then, two pages later, he says that, "Many of the religious movements that came to life in the Church of the nineteenth century bear the name of a particular devotion that gave them birth: the Assumption, the Sacred Heart, the Immaculate Heart of Mary," and adds that, "This need to give prominence to a devotion, where one would rather have expected a conception of faith, is partly due to our distance in time from Jesus Christ" (p. 5).

It is certainly tragic to find, in a well-recommended book of Marian doctrine, an assertion that there is a *radical distinction* between the *province* of faith and the *region* of devotion, and to find Our Lord's Sacred Heart, and Our Lady's Assumption and her Immaculate Heart, placed or classified in the field of devotion as distinct from faith. It is likewise tragic that the doctrines just mentioned, and the truths connected with the saying of the rosary should be called "lower forms of religious awareness" and as "not pure" in themselves.

M. Guitton's anxiety to use terms acceptable to contemporary intellectuals occasionally gets him into difficulties in his treatment of "The Virgin of History." Commenting on the joy of Our Lady and of

St. Elizabeth at the time of the Visitation, he tells us that "There is something delirious in it all, as if an element of wild folly had penetrated their souls" (p. 34). Speaking of the *Magnificat,* he opines that, "It is hard to believe that thirty or forty years after this scene Mary could have remembered the exact words she uttered on that occasion" (p. 35). "The *Magnificat* may well be admired for its lack of decoration, for its innocence—one might almost say for its banality" (p. 36).

In the third part of the book, "The Mystery of Mary," M. Guitton comes to grips with what he calls "the difficulty of effecting a transition from the human and historical Mary to the celestial being represented by piety and dogma" (p. 116). He tells us that, "From the very moment of her conception the Mary of piety and dogma is endowed with extraordinary privileges; she was apparently divorced from our human condition even during her temporal existence; now, 'raised to heaven,' she exercises a dominion of her own, with all the attributes of eternity and divinity," and, as far as "the human and historical Mary" is concerned, "we see," according to M. Guitton, "a creature apparently similar to ourselves. She is conscious only of the present, subject to all kinds of limitations and burdensome duties; she has no knowledge of the future; she shares the ideas of her family and people" (p. 116).

Of course Catholic dogma does not teach that Mary has all the attributes of divinity. Nor does history teach us that, on earth, she knew nothing of the future.

The part on "The Mystery of Mary" ends with a section on "The Virgin and Protestant Thought." What the author sets out to do is to take the principles opposed to those of Catholic theology and to apply these teachings to the mystery of Mary. After explaining the Protestant position on justification or conversion, and after comparing the works of Wesley and Montfort (who "were both working for regeneration"), he tells us that, "This is not the place to make a considered judgment on these two types of spirituality and conversion; all that we are concerned to do is to show how they are opposed in their rival conceptions of the function of time" (p. 157). Frankly, as these positions are represented here, a reader might very well be confused into imagining that there was no great practical difference involved between them.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

THE ENEMY WITHIN. By Raymond J. de Jaegher and Irene Corbally Kuhn. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1952. Pp. 314. $3.75.

Accounts depicting the awesome state of affairs behind the Bamboo Curtain are gradually becoming available. This is one of them.

Fr. Raymond de Jaegher, a Belgian missionary priest, marshals an impressive series of experiences that crossed his path during the fateful years from 1937, when the Reds first arrived in his area in North China, until 1949, when as a marked man he made good his escape abroad.

With a vigilant eye and keen intelligence, this veteran missioner observes and describes the satanic technique of the Red leaders as they first win the good will of an unsuspecting people and then, when securely intrenched, tighten their grip upon them into a stranglehold too firm to break.

Incidents and observations, personal encounters and conversations with personalities prominent on the China scene, all are vividly described against a background of Chinese history and culture in the limpid style of Irene Corbally Kuhn, noted writer and war correspondent, who collaborated with Fr. de Jaegher in the preparation of the book.

It is not the type of book that finds favor with pinkish reviewers. The facts recounted are too damaging to the Communist cause. But every fair-minded American, and particularly members of the Catholic laity and clergy, would do well to read it and ponder over its message. Communist ideology in the abstract is one thing; but Communism in practice, as revealed by Fr. de Jaegher, is something well calculated to shock the indifferent out of their perilous lethargy. The rapid success of the Red leaders in undermining the millennial moral patrimony of three hundred million Chinese, stifling their will to resistance by means of extortion, blackmail and horrible barbarities that all, including young children, are obliged not only to witness but to applaud, indoctrinating youth to accept patent falsehood for truth and to discard love as a vice while espousing hatred as a virtue, is the impossible become commonplace fact.

An interlude, covering some twenty pages only but quite as fascinating as the Stanley-in-search-of-Livingstone classic, is the graphic story of the hazards encountered by Fr. de Jaegher when he sets out from the center of Red territory to find the noted Fr. Vincent Lebbe. While avoiding all villages held by the Japanese, he gradually makes his way with a companion across the Communist lines into the region held by the Nationalists, where Fr. Lebbe is working with his Brothers of St. John the Baptist in an ambulance unit "somewhere." He finally comes upon him quite unexpectedly but their joyful reunion is cut short a few days later. In a treacherous maneuver the Communists attack and almost wipe out the Nationalist Fifth Army under General Sun. Fr. Lebbe is made a prisoner while Fr. de Jaegher and his companion manage to make their devious way back to their distant mission

in the north. "In two bloody days, in that tragic spring of 1940," says Fr. de Jaegher, "the Communists executed nearly sixty thousand of their own countrymen, while a Japanese army idled and marked time in the sun less than fifty miles away."

FREDERICK C. DIETZ, M.M.

PERE LAMY. By Comte Paul Biver. Translated by Monsignor John O'Connor. Dublin: Clonmore and Reynolds, 1951, Pp. xiv+214. $2.40.

Father Lamy was a truly extraordinary man of God, to whom Our Lord Himself, Our Lady, St. Joseph, Archangels, angels, and even the Devil frequently appeared. But to these apparitions Père Lamy attached only a secondary importance. "Be suspicious of mysticism"; he loved to repeat, "Don't build a spiritual life on apparitions, especially on the apparitions of others."

His profound humility did not prevent him, however, from (a certain) facetiousness where the basic realities of life were concerned. Humor was a part of his spirituality. "Were Our Lady to knock on the door," he declared, "I would not tell her to enter," adding that those favors come at a high price.

One day as he was cleaning his church, the Blessed Virgin appeared to him, but he passed the time of the vision in a vain effort to untie the strings of an old blue apron he had put on over his cassock, quite aware of the impropriety of appearing in such an outfit before the Queen of Heaven.

Such a cast of mind could not help but attract and keep close to him the poor to whom he devoted the greatest part of his life.

Born in 1853 in the diocese of Langres in France, he was thirty-three years of age and had suffered many trials before he was able to embrace the vocation to which he felt himself called since his First Communion. He was ordained a priest in 1886 before the body of St. Vincent de Paul in the chapel of the Vincentians in Paris. "When one is in the presence of a saint as great as the one whose mortal remains are here, how insignificant one feels," he said. St. Vincent de Paul, however, obtained for him the grace of following heroically in his footsteps.

At this period, Paris was surrounded by open plains designed for defense of the city in case of war, but which in time of peace became a place of refuge for the miserable. Planks hastily thrown together sufficed for lodging, and the many huts were packed with human beings clothed in tattered rags and covered with vermin. Parisians called the place "the Zone." The chief pastime of these "zoniers" was

the salvage and sale of all that they could find in garbage pails. This was a population without religion, and its children had neither schooling nor catechetical instruction. It was in these children that Father Lamy was particularly interested. Everywhere he saw to it that children and young people were given a chance to live in an environment that was Christian and friendly. On all sides he had solicitude like St. Vincent de Paul for the most unfortunate refuse of human society. The ragpickers, the poor, the wanderers, even the thieves found in him a father who took care of their souls without forgetting to nourish their bodies. He made himself the defender of the accused, and his zeal in their behalf generally resulted in the pardon and straightening out of the culprit. And when their bread supply was about exhausted Providence rewarded Père Lamy's unwavering confidence by sending the necessary aid.

This "priest of the ragpickers" had a reputation for sanctity which was not primarily the result of his supernatural apparitions, but the result of the intensity and brillance of his apostolic soul.

One notes with regret that the author does not stress the profundity of this soul; nor does he bring to us a penetrating study of Père Lamy's spiritual life in its more intimate aspects. The reader must find for himself such nourishing wealth. His perspicacity will enable him to derive much from the delightful anecdotes that are told, and from the detailed presentation of the heavenly visions with which Père Lamy was favored. The reader will be pleased to know that spirit of this saintly priest continues to inspire the Congregation of the Servants of Jesus and Mary which he founded.

JEAN ROUX

THE SECRET OF HOLINESS. By Father James, O.F.M. Cap. Westminster: The Newman Press, 1952. Pp. 178. $2.50.

The Secret of Holiness, according to Fr. James, is that it must be *Christian*, i.e., Christ-centered. In many different ways, Fr. James drives home the point that "it is the lesson of the saints that, even amidst the shadows of the earth, they are traversed by the supernal glory of their Lord and Master, Jesus Christ" (p. 32). It is delightful how attractively simple holiness becomes when studied and pursued in Christ, the great goal of all His members. Beginning with Christ, the Saint of Saints, Fr. James develops his synthesis of the science of sanctity in the light of the Franciscan tradition.

No thoughtful reader will deem this book superficial, for all its simplicity. While he confines his references, especially in the first half of the book, to the gospels, there is beneath the smooth and shining

surface of his facile style a powerful undercurrent of philosophic thought, which bears the reader powerfully towards Christ. A happy combination of philosopher and mystic, Fr. James combines a strong grasp of Thomistic philosophy with an ardent love for the doctrine of St. Bonaventure. In this he is a credit to his order, which has, as its scholastic ideal, a mastery of the teaching of both Doctors.

While I found the book inspiring, I am sure the Catholic layman will also find it so. Its lucid presentation of the ideal of Christian perfection cannot fail to stimulate any thoughtful reader to grow up in Christ, for "the theme of this little book, whose significance is out of all proportion to its size, is that of progress in the spiritual life," the idea of progress derived both from Scripture and Tradition (p. 97). The chapters on prayer and humility draw deeply from these twin fountains of Christian theology, while not neglecting modern authors. Yet it is in the last chapter, on Mary, that Fr. James shows true originality in developing the idea of the relation of Mary to the Church, an idea which, while dear to ancient tradition, is flowering especially in these, our days.

HERMES KREILKAMP, O.F.M. Cap.

CHRIST UNCONQUERED. By Arthur Little, S. J. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. Pp. 232. $4.50.

It is imperative to remember as one reads Father Arthur Little's *Christ Unconquered* that this is primarily an epic poem. Bearing this in mind, the reader will at once realize that it was the intent of the author not to out-Gospel the divinely inspired accounts of the Savior's Passion and Death, nor even to compete with more recent (and also, in their own way, magnificent) prose verisons of the same subject, as found, for example, in the volumes of Fillion, Goodier, and Prat.

There is hardly a theme more sublime for treatment in literature than that of the great tragedy of Calvary. In ten books of more than six thousand lines of blank verse, Father Little has retold the saddest and most moving story in the history of mankind. There is no doubt in the mind after the pages have been carefully examined that this poem is the outgrowth of a profound study of the God-Man's life upon earth, composed under the bright shadowing wing of the Holy Spirit. And on the whole the work is a successful *poetic* rendering of its theme, remaining at the same time faithful to the historical essence of the Gospel narratives.

The Christ of the poem is not, like Dante's God, far away and "seen in a point"; nor like Milton's, formal and legalistic; nor like Péguy's,

delightfully familiar with His children. The centre of the dramatic action, He has here the dignity and majesty, the human warmth and appeal, that conform with our images of Him as based upon the Scriptures. The Blessed Virgin Mary, though not figuring too often in the weave of the poem, is understandingly gentle, but somehow not quite so real-to-life as Her Son. Herod, Pontius Pilate, and Annas are in turn skillfully portrayed; and of this trio the chameleon character of Pilate, now honest, now self-deceiving, is gripping drama.

There is much that could be said on the positive side as to the poem's achievement as an epic. Particularly deserving of honors are the delineation of the epic hero Christ, and the observance of unity in the whole and in the individual parts of the work. The three invocations and certain of the speeches and debates of the High Priests are likewise meritorious. More difficult of evaluation, however, is the style, which is certainly true to classical epic tradition, but which has succumbed to the lamentable pitfall of so many of Milton's imitators: it strives too consciously to bear the Miltonic stamp. The result is that we do not have a new voice, that of this talented Irish Jesuit, but we do have Milton imperfectly copied. And this will not do. As there is only one Shakespeare, so too is there only one Milton. But it is to do Father Little an injustice to say that his style fails entirely; at times it actually reaches Miltonic heights. We could only wish that it would reach its own heights, as it well might have, had this poet looked into his own heart for his verses.

A beautifully designed gift edition, with an introduction by Fulton Oursler and eleven full-page drawings by Fritz Kredel, *Christ Unconquered* makes its first American appearance. Priests and religious, in fact anyone who is given to meditation, should welcome it as an addition to their respective bookshelves.

RAYMOND ROSELIEP

THE SPIRIT OF ST. FRANÇOIS DE SALES. Translated by C. F. Kelley. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1952. Pp. 249. $3.50.

"There can be no doubt that Bishop Camus, more than any other, has contributed to fix the spirituality and spirit of St. François de Sales in our minds." No one will question the truth of this statement. The relations between the Saint and Bishop Camus were very close, and the Bishop could justly call himself the spiritual son of St. Francis for several reasons: he had him for his confessor; he was consecrated a bishop by him; and he was formed by his spiritual doctrine.

No wonder, then, that some time after the death of St. Francis pressure was brought to bear on Bishop Camus to give to the world "the